DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 251 400 SO 016 115

AUTHOR	Reed, Beth, Ed.; And Others
TITLE	Toward A Feminist Transformation of the Academy: II. Proceedings of the Annual GLCA Women's Studies Conference (6th, November 7-9, 1980).
INSTITUTION	Great Lakes Colleges Association, Ann Arbor, MI. Women's Studies Program.
PUB DATE	82
NOTE	92p.; For proceedings of other conferences, see SO 016 113-117.
AVAILABLE FROM	GLCA Women's Studies Program, 220 Collingwood, Suite 240, Ann Arbor, MI 48103 ($6.00).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Change; Educational Research; Employed Women; *Feminism; Higher Education; Integrated Curriculum; Poetry; Resource Materials; Role Conflict; Scholarship; Sex Bias; Sex Fairness; Sex Stereotypes; *Womens Studies
IDENTIFIERS	Clifton (Lucille); Rich (Adrienne); Women Administrators; Womens Literature

ABSTRACT

The keynote address, ten selected papers, and two panel discussions are included in these conference proceedings. Questions are presented by members of an opening panel (Brenda Bankart, Louise Bernikow, Deborah Hilty, and Doris Friedensohn) based on the personal experiences and work of individual panelists. The keynote address, "Toward a Feminist Transformation of the Academy: The Search for Wholeness, Again" (Elaine Reuben), precedes 10 selected papers. The first paper is entitled "Lucille Clifton: Black Feminist Poet" (Valerie Lee). The second paper, "'Phantasia for Elvira Shatayev' as Revolutionary Feminist Poem" (Marianne Whelchel), defines qualities in the poem by Adrienne Rich that make it not only a political poem but also a revolutionary feminist poem. The next two papers, "Role Conflict for Women in Positions of Authority" (Elaine Martin) and "Women and Work: The Managerial Impasse" (Robin L. Bartlett and Charles Poulton-Callahan) deal with barriers facing women at the managerial level. Other papers include "The Call for Feminist Theory: Will We Recognize the Answer?" (Joan Straumanis), "Questions and Reflections on Science for Women" (Joan Cadden), "Subject Access to Works on Women" (Margaret L. Rogal), "Government Publications for Women's Studies Research: An Introduction" (Eileen McGrath), "Archives and Women's History Research" (Marlene Merrill), and "Three Decades of Reminiscences About Women in the Academy" (Thalia Gouma-Peterson). A final presentation from the closing panel, "The Women's Studies Connection--Where Are We in a Wider Context?" (Eva Hooker) and a schedule of conference events conclude the document. (LH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED251400

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- [✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.]
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Katherine Loring

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Toward a Feminist Transformation of the Academy: II

Proceedings of the Sixth Annual GLCA Women's Studies Conference

November 7-9, 1980

Edited by Beth Reed
Editorial Committee: Len Berkey, Kaaren Courtney,
Mildred Newcomb, Martha Rainbolt

SO 016 115

The Great Lakes Colleges Association
Women's Studies Program

Copyright © 1982 by the GLCA Women's Studies Program
220 Collingwood, Suite 240, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48103

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Opening Panel: FROM OUR WORK AND EXPERIENCE: QUESTIONS FOR THE ACADEMY

Brenda Bankart, Louise Bernikow, Deborah Hilty, and Doris Friedensohn 1

Keynote Address: TOWARD A FEMINIST TRANSFORMATION OF THE ACADEMY: THE SEARCH FOR WHOLENESS, AGAIN

Elaine Reuben 11

Selected Papers

LUCILLE CLIFTON: BLACK FEMINIST POET

Valerie Lee 17

"PHANTASIA FOR ELVIRA SHATAYEV" AS REVOLUTIONARY FEMINIST POEM

Marianne Whelchel 24

ROLE CONFLICTS FOR WOMEN IN POSITIONS OF AUTHORITY

Elaine Martin 28

WOMEN AND WORK: THE MANAGERIAL IMPASSE

Robin L. Bartlett and Charles Poulton-Callahan . . 36

THE CALL FOR FEMINIST THEORY: WILL WE RECOGNIZE THE ANSWER?

Joan Straumanis 51

QUESTIONS AND REFLECTIONS ON SCIENCE FOR WOMEN

Joan Cadden 57

SUBJECT ACCESS TO WORKS ON WOMEN

Margaret L. Rogal 62

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR WOMEN'S STUDIES RESEARCH: AN INTRODUCTION

Eileen McGrath 66

ARCHIVES AND WOMEN'S HISTORY RESEARCH

Marlene Merrill 71

THREE DECADES OF REMINISCENCES ABOUT WOMEN IN THE ACADEMY

Thalia Gouma-Peterson 73

Selection from the Closing Panel

HISTORY OF A WEEKEND

Eva Hooker 77

Schedule of Conference Events 79

The papers, panels, and keynote address in this publication are edited versions of the Conference presentations.

The Great Lakes Colleges Association includes the following institutions: Albion College, Antioch College, Denison University, DePauw University, Earlham College, Hope College, Kalamazoo College, Kenyon College, Oberlin College, Ohio Wesleyan University, Wabash College, and The College of Wooster.

Opening Panel

FROM OUR WORK AND EXPERIENCE: QUESTIONS FOR THE ACADEMY

Panelists: Brenda Bankart (Moderator), Psychology, Wabash College; Louise Bernikow, Author, New York City; Deborah Hilty, Executive Assistant to the President, The College of Wooster; and Doris Friedensohn, Women's Studies and American Studies, Jersey City State College.

BRENDA BANKART: In preparing for this panel, I took the opportunity to reread the 1978 Barnard publication of their panel discussion on "Creating Feminist Works."[1] At that conference, the panelists were concerned with what it means to create feminist works: How does one start? How can and should we work? How do we survive while we work?

Those same issues are entirely relevant to the theme of today's panel: "From Our Work and Experience: Questions for the Academy." All of us here have encountered the realities of working in academia, an academia which is not yet feminist. This fact creates, I think, an inevitable schizophrenia. We are, on the one hand, feminists, and as such have certain values, beliefs, goals, and responsibilities consistent with our feminism. On the other hand, we find ourselves working as teachers and scholars in a male-dominated, male-centered belief system as a recent New York Times article, "Women's Graves of Academe," reminds us:

> A recent report by the American Association of University Professors indicates a worsening situation for women seeking tenure. While 70 percent of all male professors have tenure, less than half of female faculty members are tenured. Between 1975 and 1978, the social-science fields had a 4 percent growth in tenure for men and only a 1.5 percent growth for women. Further, women professors in any area of 'women's studies' have even less of a prayer.[2]

Elizabeth Minnich has pointed out that the creation of feminist works requires us "to call on resources excluded from the professional, technical tools, and discourse that constitute specific academic disciplines. It is to reach back into our own experience, to rediscover sources of understanding and creativity that all too often we have had to turn off -- vehemently -- in order to become proper, credentialed scholars."[3]

We find ourselves, as feminists, trying to accomplish at times seemingly incompatible sets of goals. When can and should we work for ourselves, and when for the academy? Is it possible to do both and remain whole? Is it possible to restructure the academy in ways which provide a more fertile ground for feminist scholarship and teaching?

Nancy Miller, who participated in that Barnard conference panel, used a particularly compelling metaphor to describe the schizophrenic experience many feminists face:

> I live in a one-bedroom apartment. The one bedroom in question has been separated into equal areas by a room divider of standing bookcases. On one side of the divide is my bed and my t.v. On the other, my desk, more bookcases, and a reading chair. A telephone negotiates that awkward partition, as does my body. I devised this obstacle course so that I would not have to look at my books when I went to sleep and woke up; and the obvious corollary, so that I would not be able to see my bed from the desk.
>
> What bearing does this have upon creating feminist works?
>
> I don't know exactly. In fact, I would be hard pressed to determine whether I am speaking as a feminist, a woman, an academic, a writer, or your garden variety neurotic. Nevertheless, that topography has everything to do with my experience of what I do. I battle to establish a balance of power between the two major poles of my life: my bed and my desk. I have a room of my own then, but that room is inhabited by two wary antagonists: vertical Professor Miller, who sits at her desk and writes "productively"; and horizontal Nancy who watches television from her bed and mainlines into the telephone. On a good day, the pair does not seem incompatible: the bed is occupied for a legitimate eight hours; the desk for a virtuous five; and all is right both in the room and with the world. On bad days, however, that ratio is skewed resolutely in favor of the bed: the typewriter is routed by t.v. programs too appalling to name in public; and Professor Miller, that recent and fragile construct, becomes a faint and guilty memory vanished by an archaic and hence more powerful adversary.[4]

Nancy's metaphor illustrates what I think is the kind of conflict many of us face today in the academy.

As feminists we must inevitably face squarely the issue of how we want to restructure the academy to make possible kinds of educational experience that will allow us and those for whom we will become mentors and role models the opportunity to develop fully as human beings. We are in danger of losing our vision of a coeducational curriculum.

In the eighties, as the recent election results illustrate, there seems to be a movement in the direction of conservatism. In higher education, that trend may be translated into powerful pressure to preserve the traditional masculine ideals on which education has been based. One wonders whether these traditional ideals will provide an environment which will nourish women's studies.

Even in the seventies, a period of great growth for women's studies, feminists working in the academy wrote and spoke constantly of the difficulty of combining the feminist self with the traditional scholarly self. Reality was never completely a stranger in the feminist's room-of-her-own. We have had always to worry about contract renewal, tenure, scholarly respectability, space, and resources to do the scholarly work which we believe will enrich our lives and further the understanding of the person, particularly the much-neglected woman. We face, then, a challenge in the eighties not only not to lose ground in a period of retrenchment, but to continue toward the creation of a truly coeducational academy.

I have heard, in the interviews we have conducted with women's studies teachers across the country, a general discouragement with the state of women's studies, a pervasive enervation of those who have worked so long and hard to promote women's studies in the academy. I suggest that the question we deal with this afternoon is analogous to Nancy's description of the topography of her room. We must battle to establish a balance of power between the feminist and the traditional academy. At times, on good days, the two seem compatible: the teaching goes well, the scholarship is productive, the committee work seems useful. On those bad days, it seems as if the ratio is skewed in favor of the academy. We must impress our colleagues and the administration if we hope to get tenure. We must put aside our feminist scholarship, which is not respected, in favor of doing less personally rewarding work. We argue that, if we are to be effective, we must retain our jobs. It is often a painful experience.

I fear we will be lost in the shuffle if we believe that we have to "accept the inevitable." Many women's studies leaders pinpoint the problem when they say that their particular programs have no central philosophy or ideology to guide them during these next few years; most are concerned with the very practical problem of how to hang on to the gains that they have already made. And yet, I think the development of that philosophy is the very thing on which our survival depends.

At the same Barnard conference, Elizabeth Minnich addressed the question of how one recognizes feminist work. She said, "These, then, are some of the touchstones by which we recognize feminist works: they are dangerous to accepted sexist stereotypes and ideologies in a very inclusive and basic way; they reveal their creator in a way which includes and inspires us rather than calling on us to submit and admire; they move where feelings and thoughts lead, even if in so doing they at first appear odd; they issue from someone who is speaking for herself; speak to and for us all as humans, if we are both willing and able to listen."[5]

This afternoon we have asked our panelists to grapple with what it means to be feminist in the academy; how being a feminist affects their work and their lives. I suspect that while they will often be speaking from personal experience, they will not be speaking, as Nancy Miller puts it, "idiopathically." Their experiences in many instances will be ours.

LOUISE BERNIKOW: The title of my presentation is "Why Can't I Think and Why Can't I Dream in the Groves of Academe?" The things I'm going to say are the tip of the iceberg, a gloss on things that, looking over the program, I see coming up again and again over the next few days. I am trying to describe what I experience as my own particular difficulty with academic life and hope that it has some resonance in other people's lives and that the description of the difficulty helps to name the problem. I have no solutions at all.

I have spent my life dropping in and dropping out of the academy, both as a graduate student and as a teacher. I have felt unable to pursue within the academy the two books I have published that are now used in women's studies courses. The first, The World Split Open, is a collection of supressed poetry by women with an introductory essay in which I saw myself re-writing literary history from the point of view of women, imagining the work of those poets as the central stream. When I tried to do that work at Columbia as a Ph.D. thesis I was told that it was too "heroic." Among Women, the second book, is written in a style reviewers have called "idiosyncratic," "personal," "intuitive," "rhapsodic," and "eccentric." It genuinely is. I felt too corseted within conventional academic life to produce Among Women there and I am about to describe why.

I have three questions for the academy. THE FIRST IS: What do we do with the furniture?

I am thinking about the room in which I took my oral exams when I was a graduate student. There was a round seminar table in the center and the walls were covered with enormous portraits of the eminent men of the university in their robes, glowering, as it seemed to me, down on me as I struggled to identify the lines of "Paradise Lost" that had been set before me. I am thinking about the major library on the campus of the university, a large building with a string of names carved on the face of it. The names run around the building: Ovid, Vergil, Homer, Shakespeare, Milton, etcetera. These are the landmarks of intellectual culture. There is not a woman's name on it. The third piece of furniture is the single female image on the campus. It is a statue of a female figure, Alma Mater, set in the middle of the campus. She sits on a throne. Her enormous stone skirts are the skirts of a mother, inviting the poor student to come cuddle, to seek nurture.

I don't have to name my responses to these pieces of furniture here, I'm sure. But what must we do with them so that we can think and survive in the places the furniture fills?

My second question for the academy is: How in this setting can we "remain perpendicular" or, even better, learn to "jump at the sky"?

I am quoting, first from the nineteenth century woman's rights activist Lucy Stone, who wrote to her friend Antoinette Brown that she intended to "remain perpendicular," by which she meant, among other things, that she would, unconventionally, retain her own name when she married. And it was the mother of the black American novelist Zora Neale Hurston who, according to Hurston, taught her to "jump at the sky."

How can we do these things, given the idea of authority as it exists in academic life, given the ideals of objectivity as they exist in all disciplines, given what is considered "respectable," what is "central," what is "legitimate" -- which is masculine experience? Female experience, when taught, is in "women's studies" and so is different, outside, other, not the mainstream. It always needs to be defended, to be made legitimate.

How can I jump at the sky in an institution that requires specialization? That is of particular interest to me because Among Women moves from life to literature to history. Trained as a literary scholar, I approached history with great timidity, unable to believe, at times, that I was perfectly capable of reading the documents in the Schlesinger Library at Radcliffe College, making sense of them and saying what I had found. I attribute this directly to having been educated in an academic environment where one was a historian or a literary scholar or a psychologist and discouraged from speaking with any standing on any other subject. To overcome these inhibitions, I had to remove myself from the sight of the furniture that stood for those values.

How can we jump at the sky in a system that reveres only older men? The "stars" of my academic life were people like the professor who said, when I began the search for the poetic voices of women stifled by history that resulted in The World Split Open, that women were only good at the accumulation of detail (he shaped his hands into a round, pregnant belly) and not the sharp, thrusting sensibility that made good poetry. This was an eminent scholar. This was a man of great reputation, who embodied the values of the university.

My last question is about the political furniture. How, I'd like to know, do we make honest women out of ourselves and everyone around us?

Here I am thinking about the curriculum and the canon, what kinds of things are taught in schools. The process still takes something essentially white, male, and Christian and pretends that it stands for all of human experience. I know that if we leave out what is not white, not upper middle class, not heterosexual and think that we are teaching about women, we are dishonest. It is not an accurate picture of what we all need to learn and teach.

To make honest women out of ourselves, we have to address the issues of race and class. This was the most difficult part of writing Among Women. To discuss interactions between white women and black women, Jewish women and Christian women -- all the female "self" and female "other" interactions -- was, for me, painful and bewildering. Often, I got lost because there are no roadmarks. The "authorities" on the subject of race and class -- like Fanon and Sartre -- are men, speaking of masculine experience. Most university courses, if they exist, deal with race and class from the masculine point of view. To make honest women out of ourselves, we must speak of our own experience, our own understanding, our own analysis. We have to begin by acknowledging our ignorance, our envy, our anger, and our fear. And that, I think, is our first job.

DEBORAH HILTY: In April, 1976, after twelve years as a college faculty member, I defected. Formally an Associate Professor of English and Education, I became as well Secretary of the College and of the Board of Trustees and Executive Assistant to the President. (Titles, John Milton reminds us, are the devil's invention. . .) Whatever the defection may have meant to me, it was clearly viewed by some faculty colleagues as a concession to the enemy. This enemy had no name but its local habitation, Galpin Hall, was legion and was rumored to have a collective world view.

Shortly after my defection, a faculty member greeted me with the suspicious inquiry, "And what does Galpin think about X?" A true literalist of the imagination, I balked at the suggestion that despite its forboding stone edifice, Galpin actually had a brain! Four and a half years later, I know better than to pursue that question, but as a feminist I have to acknowledge my own difficulties in dealing with the notion of a monolithic institutional point of view.

A few months after making what another GLCA group has called my "midlife career change," I ran across an essay by Catherine Nicholson, which gave me pause. In the essay, entitled "How Rage Mothered My Third Birth and Exploded Me Out of the University into a New Time/Space on the Boundary Where, Thanks to Mary Daly, on a Clear Day I Can Now See Jane Harrison," Catherine argues that only by leaving the academy will women be able to secure the freedom they need to do their work. Moreover, only if women exit en masse from the academy will the impact of a feminist critique of the university have any measurable effect. In short, she maintains, working for change from within the institution is out of the question. Catherine gives three reasons for her position:

1. The air there is bad. "In universities," according to Mary Daly, ". . . are poisonous gases which are almost invisible and odorless, and which gradually stifle women's minds and spirits," In her new infant state she might not be strong enough to survive. Or if she doesn't succumb to the poison, she might develop a paralysis of cynicism, a death-in-life that neutralizes her energy -- which is exactly what the enemy wants.

2. Scholarship is political. Regardless of the academic's claims for objectivity, the facts of the past and present are viewed through the filter of the cultural preconditioning and unconscious value-assumptions of the scholar. As long as her center -- or her desired center -- is in the university, she participates in a value system which demeans and ignores women as a group. And even the fiercest feminist fighter is vulnerable to the lure of seeking male approval of her scholarship . . . . But she may be unaware that she's thereby accepting the university's male model for the research and writing she is doing. Her choice of inquiry, to dig up women's contributions to history, is not enough. If her material must be shaped to the mold sculpted and preserved by the enemy, the impact of her research will be dulled and distorted -- which is exactly what the enemy wants. . . .

3. Suppose the female scholar succeeds in moving her center to the boundary of the university, invents an effective gas mask to protect her from the noxious fumes, and chooses to remain inside -- not to fight, this time, but to create authentic women's scholarship. She still cannot be an effective force for change. FOR SHE WILL BE CONSIDERED INSANE BY THE MALE HIERARCHY THAT CONTROLS THE UNIVERSITY. . . . Let me explain:

   In the patriarchal world woman is an outsider -- more aptly put an "undersider." She cannot possibly view the phenomena of that world directly from the perspective of the male dominant insider -- or "topsider." The view of the oppressed and the oppressor are dangerously different. In the theatre if you use footlights as your principal source of illumination, the actor's face is considerably distorted by the upward angle of light. She or he appears unnatural to an audience conditioned to viewing people illuminated from overhead light

> sources. Similarly, if a woman must view the reality of the topsider's world, she is forced to use a mirror to achieve the male angle of vision, like the periscope used by the submarine captain to view the surface of the ocean. As long as the woman scholar is content to use a periscope, she is safe, tolerated because she is not threatening. But once she begins to use her own eyes -- once she insists on expounding her own vision of the male (or female) world, what she publishes will appear distorted, inaccurate, and irrational. The male-identified audience can only pronounce her insane and either mercifully ignore her rantings or lock her up. Which is exactly what the enemy wants.

I have returned frequently to Catherine's "exercise in rage," each time asking myself whether women can change institutions from within. Occasionally I tease myself with the speculation that since Catherine spent some twenty years on the faculty of a large university, she may have endured a worst-case situation; surely a small liberal arts college is a different matter. Or perhaps, my loyalty to academe is deeper than my feminism? Even my faculty mindset has been shaken: Are my craving for the theory beneath the slogan and my delight in research actually symptoms of a terminal illness acquired in a lifetime of breathing putrid vapors?

Thus challenged directly by my faculty colleagues and on paper by, among others, a feminist ex-academic, I have spent these years in administration as, in a sense, my own enemy: divided from my sisters on the faculty and elsewhere in the institution; fascinated by the larger view of education which my position makes possible, yet frustrated and torn by the compromises I have permitted myself to make: I have practiced self-censorship so long that it is beginning to come naturally. Though my commitment to women's issues runs deep, I am likely to think in terms of public relations, of institutional advancement, of ceremony and public occasions -- and, above all, of judicious articulation and documentation of College affairs.

Now all this is managed through a kind of sleight of hand which I dare not scrutinize too closely. But lest I seem hopelessly ruthless and ambitious -- a card-carrying enemy, one of THEM -- let me add that I still find it possible to be one of US, reading, thinking about, and teaching literature by women. It is still possible to spend mornings drafting Trustee minutes, with their necessarily legal language, and afternoons writing about feminist poets. In fact, reading and writing about the words of other women are among my chief survival tools. And the impersonal style which dominates my official writing does not intrude when I write for other women. In fact, the piece of writing of what I am proudest is not an argument but a meditation, and permission to write it came not from the academy but in a dream.

Louise has asked me what would happen if the woman who writes for other women were to occupy my administrative position. I try to imagine official memoranda in lyric form and committee agendas as soliloquies. I cannot yet answer Louise's question. But I can imagine what Galpin would say.

DORIS FRIEDENSOHN: My troubles with the academy began before I knew what it meant to be a feminist. For five years (1970-1975), as a dean at two different colleges, I set myself up as a spokesperson for innovation in higher education -- and as a harsh, unrelenting critic of my own institutions. I felt quite fearless in those days, perhaps because I scorned the notion of job security or permanence. Moreover, there seemed to be no end of opportunities for women administrators, and for a while I fancied the idea of moving ever upward and onward. Committed to the canons of openness and authenticity of the late sixties and seventies, I pursued my goals in countless public forums, speaking my piece without hesitation or calculation. Needless to say, I talked myself out of both deanships -- the first at a small innovative women's college, now defunct, and the second at a conventional multi-purpose state institution -- and learned much about educational change in the process.

These days I am a bizarrely contented faculty member. I am contented because I have learned how to be effective from the sidelines and behind the scenes. I have learned how to precipitate change. These days I am less ideological and less impatient, less ambitious and less arrogant. I am more canny and more cooperative, more tolerant of ambiguity and dissimulation, more apt to joke and tease than rant and rave -- although I still do a fair share of the latter. These days I no longer expect the right thing to happen for the right reasons -- and I think of the institution that employs me as my base, but not my world.

Institutions do not love their enemies, nor can they reasonably be expected to do so. While institutions often need a "conscience," they will not embrace or even pay attention to those individuals or groups who always appear to be "holier than thou." The tactics that advanced our cause and garnered student support during the era of expansion are not suited to the decades of decline. Thus feminists today can neither operate as the enemy nor constantly proclaim the moral superiority some of us sometimes feel. In the long run, neither hostility nor hubris will bring about the transformation of the academy.

You may ask: Can we be the friend of our enemy? Can we -- and should we -- mute the angers and discontents which are real, long standing, and deeply important? Do we not thereby risk being co-opted and rendered impotent, or made to feel compromised, opportunistic, absurd? In other terms: Is there a stance and role for feminists which will advance our own agendas and also assist our institutions in their basic struggle for survival? Can our specific critiques -- and our habit of critique -- help solve institutional problems hardly identified as feminist issues, while meeting feminist objectives as well? Must the agendas always be articulated as totally separate? Are there certain legitimate alliances to be made with institutions that in many ways remain non- or anti-feminist?

I return to the question: Can we be the friend of our enemy? My recent experience tells me not only that we can, but also that we must. Our colleges are in trouble and on the verge of great changes. I suspect they will change more profoundly over the next decade than they have in the last two. Feminists, I believe, are in a unique position to affect the form and direction of these changes. Let me offer some illustrations from my own campus.

At Jersey City State College, basic skills are the obsession of administrators, and professional preparation is the obsession of students. Faculty members are characteristically divided: One camp is in mourning for the death of liberal arts while the other refuses to acknowledge that the "patient" is rapidly expiring.

The liberal arts are dying at Jersey City and elsewhere because many practitioners have either forgotten or never knew how to connect learning with learners; the liberal arts are dying because they have ceased to be liberal -- ceased to assist students in the main tasks of understanding themselves and understanding the world. The demon forces of specialization and fragmentation, of form divorced from content, of the private walled off from the public, dominate and deaden the liberal arts. Our faculty, accustomed to turf battles and the great god departmentalism, seems powerless to save the ailing soul. But not completely.

Friends and supporters of women's studies, both in the departments and in the administration, see our work as a possible path back to health. If we are indeed able to provide "good medicine" for the liberal arts, it is because of who we are and how we function. Energized by the women's movement and by women's studies as a very special educational enterprise, we are at a peak of creativity and vitality. Thanks to the untiring labor of so many feminists who have demanded that attention be paid to women and that resources be allocated for services and programs, we have come into our entrepreneurial own. We seek and get grants. Much can be done without grants, but money is a wondrous thing; it buys freedom, is power, and sweeps glory in on its coattails. Grants have allowed us to implement experiments in teaching, stage ambitious public programs, acquire new collaborators, win friends, and wield surprising influence. They have removed us just far enough from the routine of teaching to let us see what we have done, and can still do, to turn around our students and ourselves; and perhaps turn the tide for liberal arts in the process. Working with issues that are of widespread concern at Jersey City, we have been able to make real headway toward achieving our feminist objectives.

One of the beauties of successful grant projects is that they often yield resources and ideas that others can use. What are we doing in women's studies that others might use? First, we have made the pain of writing pay off for our students because the writing begins with what they know; through personal writing they move into themselves in order finally to move outward -- to connect with friends, community, country, and world. Second, by small forays into their own family history using students as interviewers, we have made the past immediate, significant, approachable, and rich for students heretofore uninterested in and unmoved by historical studies. Third, we have launched our students into an examination of a pluralist society; we have prodded them to confront issues of class, race, and ethnicity, and to examine sources of commonality and of conflict; we have asked them to face the difficult task of truly understanding other lives and other ways and to see the enormous importance of striving to do so. Fourth, we have introduced them to critical points of contact between biology and culture; to life cycles and life stages in theory and practice. Fifth and last, in this oversimplified listing, we have raised with our students, in ways they cannot ignore, the interplay between our elaborate technologies and awesome bureaucracies and the individual in search of meaningful work and non-exploitative relationships.

At this moment, faculty members teaching women's studies at JCSC are relatively few -- say a dozen to fifteen -- within a rapidly widening network of other faculty eager to discuss or learn more about women's studies. Our honey pot -- money, high energy, and the spirit of adventure in teaching and programming -- attracts. Some of our friends in the network are particularly interested in men's studies, others in family and life cycle studies, still others in comparative, multi-cultural studies. In short, many of the primary issues which have emerged from the study of women's experience are immensely appealing to a growing number of colleagues; so too is an exploration of feminist pedagogy.

What will happen to women's studies, you may wonder, if we risk our feminist agenda with friendly but "unproven" others? Let me answer indirectly by saying that one of the great strengths of our Jersey City Women's Studies Program faculty is that we are neither turf-greedy nor turf-bound. Still, it will not be easy to move into a more central, more powerful position. Until now, we have found a special comfort in our struggle on the margins. Injustices abound, and we are accustomed to raising our voices in protest and insisting that "they" respond. To be outside and against "them" may seem uplifting, noble. To commit ourselves more fully to the institution as a whole by opening our doors to all of its members involves sharing our wealth and assuming other institutional responsibilities. The real challenge to feminists in the eighties is to be midwives to the transformed academy.

Footnotes

1. *Creating Feminist Works: A Panel Discussion from the Scholar and the Feminist V*, April 15, 1978. The Barnard Women's Center.

2. "Women's Graves of Academe" in *The New York Times*, November 5, 1980.

3. *Creating Feminist Works: A Panel Discussion from the Scholar and the Feminist V*, April 15, 1980. The Barnard Women's Center, page 5.

4. *Ibid.*, pages 17-18.

5. *Ibid*, pages 8-9.

KEYNOTE ADDRESS

TOWARD A FEMINIST TRANSFORMATION OF THE ACADEMY: THE SEARCH FOR WHOLENESS, AGAIN

Elaine Reuben - Coordinator, National Women's Studies Association

> ...any vision of things other-than-as-they-are tends to meet with the charge of "utopianism," so much power has the way-things-are to denude and impoverish the imagination. Even minds practiced in criticism of the status quo resist a vision so apparently unnerving as that which forsees an end to male privilege and a changed relationship between the sexes. The university I have been trying to imagine does not seem to me utopian, though the problems and contradictions to be faced in its actual transformation are of course real and severe.
>
> —Adrienne Rich, "Toward a Woman-Centered University," 1975

I last participated in a Great Lakes Colleges Association Women's Studies Conference early in 1977, just after attending the founding meeting of the National Women's Studies Association. At the NWSA Constitutional Convention in San Francisco I had seen the idea of women's studies taking a new organizational form through the efforts of many persons from across the country. In Rochester, Indiana, I witnessed and participated in a similar historical moment: the GLCA Women's Studies Committee shaping its institutional agenda, drafting the proposal that would provide support for the first major stages of consortial programming and the sharing of a vision of a transformed academy.

What has been accomplished since, here and elsewhere, is truly remarkable and surely cause for celebration. I am grateful for the opportunity this year's meeting provides to celebrate, and to reflect with you on the history that has brought us here. There are too few such moments. More often, these days, the press of the work overtakes and overwhelms the vision, a vision we need to sustain so that it can sustain us.

The idea of women's studies, the vision of a woman-centered academy, has a chronology. There is a long history that can (and on occasion should) be told as linear narrative. But the range of concerns shaping the vision of a feminist transformation of teaching and learning, the various sources of our movement toward that goal, the problems and contradictions inherent in its development and institutionalization, and the simultaneity of connections we need to make might best be communicated in something like a multi-media presentation.

Some of you know that NWSA, like other feminist organizations, has included the "Stop Action" in its modification of Robert's Rules of Order. A Stop Action interrupts the forward movement of debate and decision that parliamentary procedures were designed to enforce in order to allow participants in a business meeting to deal with concerns such linear procedures cannot accommodate. Similarly, perhaps, feminist transformational activities within the academy have included re-creation and recognition of modes of thought and expression inadequately described as "non-linear."

If Virginia Woolf seems to circle the central idea of an essay by way of image, anecdote and repetition, it is not because she is incapable of "getting to the point." Rather, the point is (at least in part) the experience and evolution of the idea: encountered, intuited, perceived from various angles—felt to be fully understood. More recently, Dorothy Dinnerstein interrupts her text in The Mermaid and the Minotaur with "Boxes," the print equivalent of a slide appearing behind a lecturer, as though to say, "While we proceed, here is something you need to be aware or reminded of. It is not a footnote, or a digression, or an aside; it is vitally related (if not linearly connected) to the main argument."

My metaphor today is the search for wholeness. While neither Woolf nor Dinnerstein, I want to share some images of and about the process of transformation in a relatively non-linear style. Let me begin with two anecdotes in counterpoint. The first is from Woolf's A Room of One's Own.

In the opening chapter, the narrator has been sitting on an Oxbridge river bank, considering the meaning of the topic, "Women and Fiction," she had been asked to address. A thought ("the sort of fish a good fisherman puts back into the water so that it may grow fatter...") had, she reports, "nevertheless, the mysterious property of its kind —put back into the mind, it became at once very exciting, and important; and as it darted and sank, and flashed hither and thither, set up such a wash and tumult of ideas that it was impossible to sit still." It was thus she found herself walking rapidly across a grass plot, only to be intercepted by a man's figure.

"Nor did I at first understand," she says, "that the gesticulations of a curious-looking object, in a cut-away coat and evening shirt, were aimed at me. His face expressed horror and indignation. Instinct rather than reason came to my help; he was a Beadle; I was a woman. This was the turf; there was the path. Only the Fellows and Scholars were allowed here; the gravel is the place for me. Such were the thoughts of a moment. As I regained the path the arms of the Beadle sank; his face assumed its normal repose, and though turf is better walking than gravel, no very great harm was done. The only charge I could bring against the Fellows and Scholars of whatever the college might happen to be was that in protection of their turf, that had been rolled for 300 years in succession, they had sent my little fish into hiding."

Fifty-some years later, concentrating on the meaning of the topic, "Toward a Feminist Transformation of the Academy," that I had been asked to address, I was interrupted by a contemporary guardian of the academic turf. I looked up to see....; but I don't have to describe The Dean for you. Surely you've met, as I have: when presenting a course proposal, a program design, a research topic, the plan for a conference.

She (it could have been He, but this Dean-in-Italics was female) is not horrified or indignant. Women, even feminists, are no longer such a shocking sight in academia: doesn't her very presence indicate how far we've come? With calm assurance she scans the titles on my shelves and the papers on my desk; reads the invitation to a conference convened, again, to consider feminist transformation of the academy; skims its program, listens to my presentation... and sighs: at my naive, activist enthusiasm and at the program committee's lack of imagination, originality and scholarly rigor.

"It's hard to see how all this fits together," she observes, "but, in any case, you've already covered it all last year. What is there left for you to do but just repeat yourselves?"

17

Instinct might have led to my pointing out (in a mildly ironic, passing sort of way, of course) that her query sounded (superficially, at least) like comments ignorant or ill-informed people have been known to make about the learned societies of which she was proudly a member, or, for the matter, about the college curriculum.

Reason, or at least strategy, suggested another response. I made an attempt to enlighten and explain about the expanding, explosive state of our art. I noted that at every meeting like this one there were new participants, new audiences with fresh perspectives on the work done to date; that the work itself—whether theory or practice, scholarship or program development, consciousness-raising or network-building—was not only continuing, but what had been accomplished so far was not yet adequately researched or recorded or assimilated or supported; that we are engaged in the difficult and complex task of identifying persons and projects who might and should interact: across and within traditional disciplines, across and within (and outside) various educational levels and settings, across differing regional and ethnic and cultural backgrounds and experiences. The fabric of our public and private lives is still being woven; our efforts have barely begun. We are certainly far from "just" repeating ourselves. I wasn't able to convince The Dean.

I do want to commend those who selected "Toward a Feminist Transformation of the Academy: II" as the 1980 GLCA Women's Studies Conference theme. In doing so, and in launching the Summer Institute that will concentrate on feminist transformation of the curriculum, GLCA names and contributes to a process that won't be completed in our lifetimes, one to which we nevertheless devote ourselves in inquiry and in action and in reflection.

Those selves are many. Many more persons than are yet visible to one another, and aspects of each of us. That multiplicity makes both for strength and confusion, potential wholeness and painful, recurrent fragmentation.

There is no clear, cumulative sequence from Beginning to Advanced Feminist Consciousness, let alone to assured, defined outcomes. In that sense we need to repeat ourselves: deepening understanding each time; aware of where we have been and creatively uncertain about where the next cycle will lead.

To speak and think about a "feminist transformation of the academy" is to take a rather more sophisticated approach to the process in which many of us found ourselves and each other and began to participate more than a decade ago. A little like The Dean, I must acknowledge, we thought then that the task we had undertaken could be wrapped up fairly quickly, our insights shared and—once heard—acted upon. We read A Room of One's Own, but hadn't fully taken in its implications for transformation of an academy to which women had just, barely, gained access.

That beginning moment, enacted once and then repeated, deepened, still, in education settings across the country and around the world, felt whole. It seemed that one, that we, could hold the entire question in mind, and spell out the complete answer in no more than several short pamphlets.

It was what Florence Howe referred to recently as "the counting phase," when—as Alice Rossi once noted—significant feminist research could be done with the campus catalogue and faculty directory. We looked-and-saw that there were few female faculty to be role models for students or to indicate institutional commitment to employment of women; it took us a bit longer to realize that there were virtually no women in policy-making positions. There were too few (if any) indications in the curriculum that women existed or contributed to history. There were too few services that responded to the needs of women on the campus and in the community surrounding....

Therefore, our pamphlets said, we shall (or "they should") monitor and change the discriminatory hiring and promotion practices; develop new courses; demand/provide/permit new policies and new services...Meanwhile, we would meet among ourselves and share and counsel, perhaps check out the career office and do a day care survey...And so it began.

We appeared on talk shows; we wrote articles for local papers and movement journals and formed study groups, caucuses and coalitions; we took part in panels and created events. Affirmative action offices were established; new areas of law developed. Courses and program committees were founded; research was undertaken. Organizations formed, within organizations of the disciplines and professions, and presented surveys--now using multiple regression analysis. Scholarship policies were examined; women's centers opened; re-entry programs for women....

At that moment, most of us were teaching ourselves and each other. In most instances, one could not have been trained and credentialed for the roles being created. There were no feminist career lines: we were still designing the position descriptions as part of our vision.

Soon, it seemed, a new moment began even as the first continued. Mimeograph became print. Reading lists became bibliographies. Organizations created sub-organizations, directories and coordinating committees.

Those who knew about health services no longer felt knowledgeable about women in the labor force, and those adding feminist perspectives to established continuing education programs were in a different network from those establishing shelters for battered women. Those speaking "Title IX" and "Title IV" couldn't talk "faculty development" and/or "rape crisis." Those learning assertiveness or educational administration met; those exploring lesbian consciousness met; third world women were down the hall, while art historians in the next room didn't always see that their work paralleled the literary critics, whose efforts were related to the philosophers and connected, like so much else, to the psychologists, sociologists and social historians....

In each sub-group there was a first moment, then a second. The fish had gotten even fatter and more lively. But the wholeness of our vision became very hard to sustain.

We have not repeated ourselves, except in the necessary ways, but rather extended and over-extended ourselves and our inquiries far beyond what we glimpsed ten years ago. Each paragraph in those first organizing pamphlets became a book and then a series of books; each sentence became a grant proposal and then a series of projects. More and more of us became competently specialist at new, interdisciplinary formulations of problem topics we hadn't even glimpsed when we began.

Like the unfortunates who aspired to the heavens at the Tower of Babel, however, feminists began stumbling into and past one another, feeling divided and separated even in the continuing effort to struggle in common. The second moment lacks the exhilaration of the visionary beginning. Construction and maintenance can be more frustrating and tedious than design, particularly when the new dwelling must be built within the shell of the old.

It is at gatherings like this one (as in some small groups, or as individuals when we are able to seize a moment for reflection)—and even then only with planning and effort, personal and/or communal—that the shape of the whole becomes visible again and a felt sense of how the parts of our work and our selves connect.

We come together here, convinced—however intuitively—that the academy must be transformed. We come in search of companions in that task and belief who can provide, by their very presence, a sense of personal wholeness. Elsewhere I have argued that the disparity in technological resources for communications between the have-nots and the haves in our era makes for very different and more difficult struggles than those of other times and places: we send bulk mailings, they use private mail services; we travel long distances to meet, while they sit calmly in teleconferencing studios.

But, as Donna Allen reminds me when we talk about women's media, this oral-passing-on-you-had-to-be-there mode of communication is not "just" a primitive, lesser form; it is part of our statement and our process, transmitting information and experience, creating—when we are lucky—a utopia.

That term has become associated with foolish, liberal, wishful thinking, an ideal that can never be realized. Concentrate for a moment on its derivation—utopia: no place, a place that doesn't (yet) exist. When we come together here we create a community that didn't exist, and it does for the moments we share. Having experienced it, we know better what our aching search for wholeness in the academy and beyond is about.

Last year at this time Elizabeth Minnich reflected on the theory and practice of friendship and criticism in the feminist academy. I understand that concept to be very much about wholeness: the highest form of friendship is not another's completing us, but another recognizing and accepting the completeness we want to experience for ourselves. The energy that comes from our utopian moments has, I believe, that source: colleagues, sisters, friends with whom we can share more completely than is the case elsewhere the multiple and sometimes contradictory aspects of our lives.

Because "elsewhere," the so-called real world, depends upon our fragmentation and separation. Among the images and echoes that came to me when I was preparing these remarks was a passage from the early Marx, on the division of labor:

> For as soon as the distribution of labor comes into being, each man has a particular, exclusive sphere of activity, which is forced upon him and from which he cannot escape. He is a hunter, a fisherman, a shepherd, or a critical critic, and must remain so if he does not want to lose his means of livelihood; while in communist society, where nobody has one exclusive sphere of activity but each can become accomplished in any branch he wishes, society regulates the general production and thus makes it possible for me to do one thing today and another tomorrow, to hunt in the morning, fish in the afternoon, rear cattle in the evening, criticize after dinner, just as I have a mind, without ever becoming hunter, fisher, shepherd or critic.

And I realized that Marx' utopian image of men's wholeness was very like the social/historical experience of women who've struggled to live in both the public and private spheres, however much exploited and excluded by patriarchal institutions. To have the baby under the arm and the book on the table and the menu and the meeting both in mind is hard, as we know, when our real world has been structured to support and value those who are more specialized in their life activities.

The patriarchal academy has, certainly, exploited and excluded women. We are, even now, only beginning to share our understanding of that history--some of which was there to be seen, some of which has had to be found, all of which needs to be studied and told. I feel more and more embattled and embittered by the false history and phony feminism that allows a Newsweek article on "The Humanities in American Life" to open with the statement the "to know the best of what has been thought and written, to be able to think critically, to be morally discerning were the marks of an educated person and leader of the civitas (emphasis mine)." Mathew Arnold was not speaking about us, nor were the others we were taught to consider the best thinkers and writers. If the Beadle seems a poetic, Woolfian exaggeration, read Frederick Rudolph's 1962 history, The American College and University, for an unblushing analysis of the way in which liberal studies were diminished from "man's noblest inheritance" to something "ornamental, dilettantish and feminine" because of the presence of women in the academy.

We are "in the academy," but it does not allow us to be whole. For now, we must do that as we can for one another, making the connections between ideas that the fragmentation of knowledge into departmental turf has separated, and the connections between our ideas and our lives and the institutions that we are in need of transforming and creating. As feminists pursue, for example, the work of social-developmental psychologists/educational theorists/moral philosophers like Carol Gilligan, asking new and important questions about the female life cycle and the institutions that would support it and allow it to be whole, we will see—again—the connections we need to make.

One of Gilligan's themes is the distinction between emphasis on rights and emphasis on responsibilities, between justice and mercy: the former so-called "male" and the latter "female." In her work, and of course in that of many others, these dichotomies and their transvaluation and reintegration is a central concern.

Responsibility and mercy imply relationships, awareness of collective needs and individual complexity. It may well be that the nature of the institutions represented here—their size and relative isolation into community—is a partial explanation for the leadership role GLCA has been able to play in women's studies: maintaining, in these conferences, e.g., a mix and balance between so-called scholarly and so-called institutional issues, between public concerns and persons' feelings, between students and faculty and administrators, women and men. You may have, in that sense, maintained the vision of wholeness from our beginnings as we move into the next cycles, again to confront issues Virginia Woolf posed years ago.

In Three Guineas, the question is no longer access to the academy but survival within it as a whole and human person. The answer, thus, again, must be continuation of the process toward feminist transformation of the academy.

LUCILLE CLIFTON: BLACK FEMINIST POET

Valerie Lee, Denison University

Most people searching for a feminist perspective in black literature turn most readily to the works of Zora Hurston, Alice Walker, Audre Lorde, or Toni Morrison. However, there are many black women writers who are less known to feminists, but whose works remain in the integrity of a feminist vision. One such poet is Lucille Clifton. Clifton's poetry excites me becuase she is black and female concurrently. Instead of juggling, slighting, or submerging concerns of gender for those of race, or vice versa, she gives us a dual vision, a double perspective. Clifton writes of persons who, to use Morrison's words, "(have) nothing to fall back on: not maleness, not whiteness, not ladyhood, not anything. And out of the profound desolution of (their) reality, (they) may very well have invented (themselves)."[1]

Without power or privilege, how does a woman poet begin to "invent herself"? An initial step is to avoid stereotypes by giving one's audience fresh, honest images of the female character or voice within the poem. Consider a very representative poem by Clifton that does exactly this:

> the thirty eighth year
> of my life,
> plain as bread
> round as a cake
> an ordinary woman.
>
> an ordinary woman.
>
> i had expected to be
> smaller than this,
> more beautiful,
> wiser in Afrikan ways,
> more confident,
> i had expected
> more than this.
>
> i will be forty soon.
> my mother once was forty.
>
> my mother died at forty four,
> a woman of sad countenance
> leaving behind a girl awkward as a stork.
> my mother was thick,

---

[1] Cited in Mary Helen Washington, Black-Eyed Susans (New York: Anchor Press, 1975), VIII.

her hair was a jungle and
she was very wise
and beautiful
and sad.

i have dreamed dreams
for you mama
more than once.
i have wrapped me
in your skin
and made you live again
more than once.
i have taken the bones you hardened
and built daughters
and they blossom and promise fruit
like Afrikan trees.
i am a woman now.
an ordinary woman.

in the thirty eighth
year of my life,
surrounded by life,
a perfect picture of
blackness blessed,
i had not expected this
loneliness.

if it is western,
if it is the final
Europe in my mind,
if in the middle of my life
i am turning the final turn
into the shining dark
let me come to it whole
and holy
not afraid
not lonely
out of my mother's life
into my own.
into my own.

i had expected more than this.
i had not expected to be
an ordinary woman.[2]

Note how different this portrait is from traditional black matriarchal portraits. The woman in Clifton's poem does not have all the self-assurance of the mother in Hansberry's Raisin in the Sun or the "mule-of-the-world" quality that Janie's grandmother has in Their Eyes Were Watching God. Neither is she the black superwoman of television programs nor the Aunt Jemima on pancake boxes. Rather, she is one particular black woman who is going on forty and who is experiencing fear and uncertainty at this time of her life. Rarely do we get portraits of black women at this state in their lives. Most of the women are usually in the Sula/Meridian age range or Jane Pitman's bracket. The voice in Clifton's poem bridges the gap. "An Ordinary Woman" has the power to awaken within us an extraordinary response.

---

[2] An Ordinary Woman (New York: Random House, 1974), pp. 93-94.

A second characteristic of Clifton's poetry is the honest way that it deals with relationships among women. She deals with "female connectedness," the community of women. Since Clifton is a mother of four daughters, her mother/daughter poems come as no surprise. One such poem is "Last Note to My Girls," which makes use of simple but clear images. Clifton's daughters are "mellowed in a brown bag / held tight and straining / at the top / like a good lunch":

> Last Note to My Girls
> For Sid, Ricca, Gilly and Neen
>
> my girls
> my girls
> my almost me
> mellowed in a brown bag
> held tight and straining
> at the top
> like a good lunch
> until the bag turned weak and wet
> and burst in our honeymoon rooms.
> we wiped the mess and
> dressed you in our name and
> here you are
> my girls
> my girls
> forty quick fingers
> reaching for the door.
>
> i command you to be
> good runners
> to go with grace
> go well in the dark and
> make for high ground
> my dearest girls
> my girls
> my more than me. An Ordinary Women, p. 29.

Many of her "daughterhood" poems deal with everyday activities in the lives of poor women:

> at last we killed the roaches.
> mama and me. she sprayed,
> i swept the ceiling and they fell
> dying onto our shoulders, in our hair
> covering us with red. the tribe was broken,
> the cooking pots were ours again
> and we were glad, such cleanliness was grace
> when i was twelve. only for a few nights,
> and then not much, my dreams were blood
> my hands were blades and it was murder murder

all over the place. An Ordinary Woman, p. 80.

Another poem, "Sisters," reminds one of the female relationship in Sula, a relationship that Maya Angelou terms "achingly alive." The details in the poem, e.g. the greasing of black ashy legs, the touuching up of the "kinky" edges of the hair, reflect what it is like growing up in America black and female. Additionally, Clifton renders the experience through black diction, conjugating the verb "to be" not as it is traditionally done, but emphatically: I be / You be / he-she-it be / we be / you be / they be:

me and you be sisters.
we be the same.
me and you
coming from the same place.
me and you
be greasing our legs
touching up our edges.
me and you
be scared of rats
be stepping on roaches.
me and you
come running high down purdy street one time
and mama laugh and shake her head at
me and you.
me and you
got babies
got thirty-five
got black
let our hair go back
be loving ourselves
be loving ourselves
be sisters.
only where you sing
i poet. An Ordinary Woman, p. 5.

Upon reading the poem, black females recall all the beauty treatments they have subjected themselves to, realizing all the while that the Miss Americas are chosen only on white standards of beauty, that all the straightening of the hair, all the greasing of the legs will not render one white. Wearing a clothespin on one's nose as Nel does in Sula or praying for blue eyes as the black child in The Bluest Eye does will not be successful either. "Sisters," however, rises above the disappointments in life, the rats and roaches, to the relationship of the two women who go through life's transitions together. It is honest, fresh writing by a black woman for black women. It is also the kind of poem that white women can easvesdrop on and translate into their own experience. Those who cannot identify with ashy legs can substitute unshaven legs.

Clifton does have several sisterhood poems that frankly confront the tensions between black and white women. She seems to believe that only in confrontation can dialogue take place. In her poem, "In Salem," she reverses what is normally frightening. Black witches and brooms are not what we need to fear, but the "plain pink" of white women:

Weird sister
the Black witches know that
the terror is not in the moon
choreographing the dance of wereladies

and the terror is not in the broom
swinging around to the hum of cat music

nor the wild clock face grinning from the wall
the terror is in the plain pink
at the window
and the hedges moral as fire
and the plain face of the white woman watching us
as she beats her ordinary bread.

An Ordinary Woman, p. 3.

Clifton is much more direct in her poem "To Ms. Ann":

i will have to forget
your face
when you watched me breaking
in the fields,
missing my children.

i will have to forget
your face
when you watched me carry
your husband's
stagnant water.

i will have to forget
your face
when you handed me
your house
to make a home,

and you never called me sister
then, you never called me sister
and it has only been forever and
i will have to forget your face.

An Ordinary Woman, p. 25.

The voice within the poem cannot foget the face because this face is connected to so many other female faces. Despite frictions, there exists an interconnectedness that women share as Clifton points out in "She is Dreaming":

sometimes
the whole world of women
seems a landscape of
red blood and things
that need healing,
the fears all
fears of the flesh;
will it open
or close
will it scar or
keep bleeding

will it live
will it live
will it live and
will he murder it or
marry it. An Ordinary Woman, p. 53.

Finally, Clifton's view of her craft, poetry, is also decidedly black and female. Her muse is the black female goddess, Kali:

it is the Black God, Kali,
a woman God and terrible
with her skulls and breasts.
i am one side of your skin,
she sings, softness is the other,
you know you know me well, she sings,
you know you know me well.

running Kali off is hard.
she is persistent with her
Black terrible self. she
knows places in my bones
i never sing about but
she knows i know them well.
she knows.
she knows. An Ordinary Woman, p. 47.

* * * * * * * *

Kali
queen of fatality, she
determines the destiny
of things. nemesis.
the permanent guest
within ourselves.
woman of warfare,
of the chase, bitch
of blood sacrifice and death.
dread mother. the mystery
ever present in us and
outside us. the
terrible Hindu Woman God
Kali.
who is Black. An Ordinary Woman, p. 37.

As a female poet, Clifton's apprehensions and anxieties surface in "The Poet":

i beg my bones to be good but
they keep clicking music and
i spin in the center of myself
a foolish frightful woman
moving my skin against the wind and
tap dancing for my life. An Ordinary Woman, p. 60.

In "Admonitions" Clifton uses her role as poet to instruct:

> boys
> i don't promise you nothing
> but this
> what you pawn
> i will redeem
> what you steal
> i will conceal
> my private silence to
> your public guilt
> is all i got
>
> girls
> first time a white man
> opens his fly
> like a good thing
> we'll just laugh
> laugh real loud my
> black women
>
> children
> when they ask you
> why is your mama so funny
> say
> she is a poet
> she don't have no sense.[3]

Although Clifton's poetry has won a number of traditional literary awards, her work deserves more of an audience among women. Her many collections of poems are indeed affirmations of black womanhood, of personhood.

---

[3] Good Times (New York: Random House, 1970).

"PHANTASIA FOR ELVIRA SHATAYEV" AS REVOLUTIONARY FEMINIST POEM

Marianne Whelchel, Antioch College

I first heard Adrienne Rich read "Phantasia for Elvira Shatayev" at the University of Connecticut in the spring of 1976. I was moved immensely; a woman friend of mine wept. I felt sorrow at the death of the women but at the same time, exhilaration at their triumph. I felt that Rich was celebrating something in their experience that had significance for me—that, in fact, the poem called me into their experience, asked me to participate in their triumph, challenged me to understand the meaning of their community and their love. After the reading I found that my women friends and I had responded similarly to the poem. We had all felt that Rich was speaking to us, about us, and that she was challenging us.

This description of our response may seem excessive. I should admit that at the time of the reading I was writing my dissertation on Rich and the opportunity to meet and talk with her had left me especially excited. Already deeply involved with her poetry on intellectual and emotional levels, I was prepared to be moved. Nevertheless, my friends' similarly intense reactions confirmed my belief that something out of the ordinary had gone on at the reading. That belief leads me to the issue I want to consider in relation to this poem and others. As a feminist critic, I see literature as necessarily political; I see a small number of literary works as revolutionary. I am interested here in defining the qualities in "Phantasia" that make it not only a political poem but a revolutionary one, for the revolutionary aspects of the poem account, I believe, for my own and my friends' responses to it.

Adrienne Rich believes in the necessity for a feminist revolution and she wants her poetry to contribute to that revolution. The poems in Diving into the Wreck are informed by a feminist critique of patriarchal institutions and of personal relationships. A few of the poems verge on being revolutionary, but it is primarily the poems appearing since Diving into the Wreck that are revolutionary. I would suggest that revolutionary poetry, as opposed to merely consciously political poetry, moves beyond exploration, criticism, and analysis to posit alternatives to currently existing social structures and personal relationships. And the revolutionary poet assumes a different relationship with her/his audience from that typically assumed by many twentieth-century poets: she/he assumes a bardic relationship.[1] Hence, the revolutionary poet does not accept alienation

---

[1] "The Fact of a Doorframe" suggests that Rich accepts this bardic role:

Now, again, poetry,
violet, arcane, common,
hewn of the commonest living substance
into archway, portal, frame
I grasp for you, your bloodstained splinters, your
ancient and stubborn poise
—as the earth trembles—
burning out from the grain

from the audience, but assumes and hopes for community with the audience and, in fact, tries through rhetorical strategies, as well as content, to forge that community. Speaking of Elizabeth Gould Davis' accomplishment in The First Sex, Rich describes the role of the feminist revolutionary poet:

> Out of a blend of fact and guesswork, fragments of rumor, memory and desire, she tried to do in prose what the poet of earlier times did in epic or ballad—to call up before women a different condition than the one we have known, to provide an alternative to recitations of oppression, to prime the imaginations of women living today to conceive of other modes of existence.[2]

The revolutionary poet posits alternatives, creates community with the audience, inspires and challenges that audience to change.[3]

In her poetry and prose Rich increasingly takes the position that because of tradtional sex roles, the nurturing necessary for women's full development is available to them now mainly in relationships with other women. In "Phantasia for Elvira Shatayev" Rich creates an image of women working and achieving together in a situation where cooperation and commitment to each other's welfare is necessary both for success and survival. Rich commented in a 1975 interview: "It's not as interesting to me to explore the condition of alienation as a woman as it is to explore the condition of connectedness among women."[4] The mountain climbers' experience is an example of this connectedness among women, and Rich's celebration of the connectedness and consistent presentation of it as an alternative to alienation and to less fulfilling relationships is essentially what makes "Phantasia for Elvira Shatayev" a revolutionary poem. A closer look at the poem should show how the women's experience becomes a model for the audience and how Rich creates community with the audience and challenges the audience to change.

The poem is a straightforward monologue spoken from beyond death by Shatayev who recalls the team's experience and interprets its meaning. (The poem's directness and its immediate accessibility despite certain subtleties are other characteristics of revolutionary poetry.) As Shatayev speaks, she recalls her own and her companions' progress toward commitment to making the climb together:

> For months   for years   each one of us
> had felt her own yes   growing in her
> slowly forming   as she stood at windows   waited
> for trains   mended her rucksack   combed her hair
> what we were to learn   was simply   what we had
> up here

---

[2] Adrienne Rich, "The Origin of Feminist Myth-Making," tribute to Elizabeth Gould Davis, The Boston Phoenix 3, No. 37 (September 10, 1974), 15.

[3] My thoughts about revolutionary poetry have been influenced by a number of sources, among them the article "Tom Eliot meets the hulk at the Little Big Horn: the political economy of poetry," by Marge Piercy and Dick Lourie. The article appears in Literature in Revolution, edited by George Abbott White and Charles Newman (Chicago: Northwestern University Press, 1972).

[4] "Interview: Adrienne Rich," by Blanch M. Boyd, Christopher Street 1, No. 7 (January 1977), 14.

"What we had / up here" is the achievement of climbing so far together and the possibility of reaching the top of Lenin Peak. Emphasizing this achievement, Shatayev contrasts climbs with her husband—". . . when I trailed you in the Caucasus"—with her present attempt: "Now I am further / ahead than either of us dreamed anyone would be." She stresses what could have been, were it not for the storm: "we could have stitched that blueness together like a quilt." The quilting image seems a curious and homely one for conquering a mountain. However, through it Rich suggests that the same communal female energy that once went into such domestic affairs as quilting can be as effectively channeled to achievement in nondomestic areas, not for others in the family, but "for ourselves." She implies that in acting as a group on behalf of their own desires and interests, "choosing ourselves each other and this life," they claimed a right long taken for granted by man—a claim which required "changes elemental and minute." Thus, "what we had / up here" is not only their achievement in climbing but also their affirmation of *self* and of their unity with each other.

Rich imagines Shatayev recalling what she had written in a diary of the climb, and in the lines we see that this unity among the women represents a new kind of love:

> *I have never loved*
> *like this I have never seen*
> *my own forces so taken up and shared*
> *and given back*
> *After the long training the early sieges*
> *we are moving almost effortlessly in our love*

This love is mutually nourishing for the women rather than self-sacrificing as in the love traditionally expected of women as wives and mothers. In the women's relationship Rich imagines love and power united in a way she sees made impossible by the roles traditionally assigned in heterosexual relationships.[5]

But is it not mere affirmation of self that interests Rich. That would be the way of the individual woman who succeeds—the token woman. For the self-affirmation and realization that Rich is concerned with takes place only in community and the poem makes clear that it is impossible in any other context. Thus, the story of the mountain-climbing team is perfect for this perception, for the very life, as well as success, of the individual climber absolutely depends on the team. She underlines these points by imagining Shatayev's diary:

> In the diary as the wind began to tear
> at the tents over us I wrote:
> *We know now we have always been in danger*
> *down in our separateness*
> *and now up here together but till now*
> *we had not touched our strength*

The lines have meaning beyond the mountain climber's experience. The experience becomes a metaphor for the community of women Rich has been calling for in her poetry from Diving into the Wreck to the present—a community acting together, supporting each other, achieving together. The women's experience is transformed into myth as they "stream / into the unfinished   the unbegun / the possible." These lines challenge the audience to finish what the women of the poem have begun and even to conceive the possible on a yet grander scale. Lines a little later in the poem work similarly:

---

[5] Numerous other poems show Rich's concern with defining and living a new kind of love. In "Splittings" she "refuse(s)" "the splitting / between love and action," between love and power. "Paula Becker to Clara Westhoff" contrasts a mutually nourishing love relationship between two women with an unequally nourishing marriage relationship.

choosing ourselves   each other   and this life
whose every breath   and grasp   and further foothold
is somewhere   still enacted   and continuing

The lines again underscore the fact that the women's experience is unfinished and imply that it must be, and actually is being, taken up by others. Hence, these lines, too, challenge the audience.

That the women died in their attempt to reach the top of Lenin Peak becomes less important than what they have realized in their experience together. The poem ends with lines from the imagined diary:

What does love mean
what does it mean   "to survive"
A cable of blue fire ropes our bodies
burning together in the snow   We will not live
to settle for less   We have dreamed of this
all of our lives

The question of love's meaning speaks to Rich's many poems in which literally living women, "in love" in the traditional sense, are "dead," "unborn," "undead," "aborted" ("The Mirror in Which Two are Seen as One," "From an Old House in America," "To a Poet") and the fire imagery reminds us of the many images of fire in earlier Rich poems where individuals burn in isolation from each other, their anger and energy unexpressed, unfocused, or undirected into action ("The Phenomenology of Anger," "Burning Oneself In"). Such "survival," this poem says, is unacceptable. Significantly, here, the women are "burning together"; the use of this particular image suggests the transformation into positive action of energy before lost in anger, frustration. It is better to risk physical death than to compromise — merely "survive." The poem, then, calls women to communal commitment and action. It asks them to risk "changes elemental and minute." It is revolutionary in that it presents through the women's experience a positive alternative, creates community with the audience, and challenges the audience to change.

ROLE CONFLICTS FOR WOMEN IN POSITIONS OF AUTHORITY

Elaine Martin, Albion College

One of the most dramatic social changes in the United States in this century has been the large-scale movement of women into the labor market. Women now constitute over forty percent of the workforce. Unfortunately, attitudinal changes about sex roles have lagged far behind this change in social practices (Carnegie Report, 1976). Traditional ideology still places woman in the home, while current economic reality places her in the workplace.

The purpose of this paper is to examine the common role conflicts faced by those women who attain positions of authority in the public domain and to describe the choices they make about how to deal with those conflicts. This examination will be based on an interpretation of relevant literature from studies of women in academia, in the military, in politics, and in corporate management. The basic thesis of this paper is that women face sex-specific obstacles not only in attaining formal positions of authority in our society, but also in exercising their legitimate authority once they attain such positions. This author contends that these difficulties arise out of a social and individual ambivalence felt by both men and women about how women ought to behave in exercising the power that has traditionally been a male attribute. As Patricia Garvin, a psychologist at Annapolis, said about the courageous young women who broke the sex barrier at Annapolis: "For these women, there aren't any norms." (Adams, 1980).

Women today are engaged in devising new norms and adapting old ones to guide them in their work-a-day world. This effort is most difficult for the relatively few women who are exercising organizational power over others, in large part because of the sex-stereotyped expectations of subordinates. For example, according to a 1980 nation-wide public opinion poll (Roper Organization, 1980), twenty-eight percent of working women and twenty-six percent of working men prefer to have a male supervisor. The women say that a female boss would be a harder task-master and would be more petty and emotional than a male, whereas a male would be more thoughtful and make them feel more comfortable. Only five percent of the women surveyed and three percent of the men preferred a woman boss.

Evidence suggests that the type of aggressive, dominant behavior associated with leadership is considered appropriate for men, but deviant for women (Lynn and Flora, 1977). Thus, a person who has personality traits of assurance, dominance, and independence will be perceived as mentally "healthy" if male, but "unhealthy" if female. Healthy females are supposed to be passive, submissive, and dependent (Gove and Tudor, 1973). These characteristics are clearly at odds with presently accepted concepts of successful management behavior in both the public and corporate realms.

It has become relatively commonplace to speak of the powerlessness of women. In this general sense, the word "power" refers to potency or control, an ability to cause something to happen or not happen, or to influence the behavior of others through the use of sanctions or rewards. Authority is a special form of power, implying legitimacy and more or less automatic obedience without necessary resort to coercion. One commands by authoritative presence (Easton, 1958). Authority may be based on hierarchical rank, charisma, or simply custom and tradition. An essential element of authority, whatever its base, is obedience on the part of the subordinate out of an acceptance of the legitimacy of the command. Thus, for women professionals to assert legitimate authority, their legitimacy must be accepted by others. Many women professionals are finding that they must deal with sex-role expectations from their co-workers and subordinates that are often at odds with traditional images of power and authority developed out of experience with male authority.

Until very recently, we could safely assume that whatever power and authority most women exercised was of a radically different sort than that which men exercised. Women controlled children, advised and supported husbands, participated in local community "good works," and generally played a non-threatening, nurturing, subordinate role to men. There could be no doubt as to their "femininity."

On the other hand, many of those few women who successfully competed with men in the public world of work and politics came to exercise a more "masculine" style of power and thereby lost their femininity. In most cases, they gave up sex and family life, becoming the stereotypical, hard-bitten, single career woman. Fortunately, it is no longer an "either-or" world. More and more women are striving to exercise so-called "masculine" power in economics and politics, without denying their rights to normal family life.

This generation's dilemma is more complex: The issue is no longer a choice between career and family. The issue is how to compete successfully in a "man's world" without losing feminine identity. There are, of course, several dimensions to this dilemma, not the least of which is one's own self-image as a woman and comfort with personal choices. The present analysis, however, will focus primarily on the practical difficulties that women professionals face in coping with the ambivalent expectations of others in their place of work. This ambivalence boils down to a fairly simple formula based on sex stereotypes: Women are supposed to be kind, supportive, nurturing, and submissive; authority figures are supposed to be firm, decisive, impersonal, and willing to impose sanctions as necessary; women who act like authority figures are not feminine: women who behave in a feminine manner do not make good authority figures.

Some Examples

The best way to illustrate how this cultural double-bind operates is to describe the experiences of women leaders in a variety of occupations. For example, if we look at academic women, we find that they may experience conflict in meeting ambivalent sex-role expectations of both their male colleagues and male students.

A recent study of women academicians at a large northeastern university reveals that the women were ineffective in developing affirmative action policies because they were afraid of offending male colleagues. They did not want to appear too aggressive on women's issues and be labeled unfeminine troublemakers. Nor did they want to appear too emotional or subjective and be considered unprofessional. The personal role-conflicts experienced by individual women faculty effectively precluded any coordinated action toward attaining power and influence (Liss, 1975).

Several studies of sexist bias in student evaluation of women faculty strongly suggest that male students are especially inclined to evaluate harshly women instructors who are "hard-graders" (Kay, 1979; Martin, 1980). According to sex-role expectations, women—even when they are in a superior position of authority—ought not to behave punitively toward males. If women faculty violate this tenet by giving male students low grades, they are perceived as misusing their authority and as incompetent or poor teachers.

Rosabeth Moss Kanter (1979), who has told us so much about successful women managers, is critical of the recent flood of books and articles giving rules of behavior for executive women. The underlying message, she says, is that women are dependent, defensive, ambivalent, and must be taught (in a very simplistic way) to become confident managers, a trick which men seem to master naturally without recourse to "how-to" books. If she is correct, the aspiring woman executive is nevertheless left in a bind. If she eschews the denigrating books, where is she to turn to determine appropriate executive norms? Most often she has no female peers, and her male peers exclude her from their communications network.

A recent army study asked whether or not West Point training and experience was psychologically "defeminizing" for young women cadets in the class of 1980. Why is this question being asked? The assumption is clearly that women who choose to strive for leadership positions in male-dominated professions are in danger of losing their femininity. Army researchers concluded that female soldiers remained feminine, because even under simulated combat conditions they continued to use skin cream, put up their hair, and wear make-up. The study also found that women cadets cannot lead their groups as effectively as men cadets, because men cadets resist their leadership. No attempt is made to correlate the women's "feminine" behavior with their inability to establish their authority; however, in a similar study women cadets complained about the attitudes of their men associates, saying that their biggest problems were negative attitudes from other people (Adams, 1980).

Finally, for feminists in positions of authority, there is pressure from other feminists to "humanize the workplace," while assertively acting in their sisters' interests. In this view, women are expected to be more moral, more humane, more concerned with the needs of individuals, than men are (Gehlen, 1977). Both male colleagues and many women expect far more humane behavior from women in leadership positions than from men. Yet these women experience the same kinds of pressures as their male colleagues, but often lack the same degree of personal and social support.

Three "Models" of Behavior

Given all the above, how have the many women organizational leaders achieved success? Listed below are three general patterns of norms of behavior for professional women: 1) the popularly-termed "male model" (Bird, 1968), which ambitious women of a generation ago chose almost exclusively, and which many women in male-dominated fields today have adapted to their present needs; 2) the "feminine" model, adopted by women who prefer to retain at least the appearance of traditional femininity and the general social acceptance that goes along with it; and 3) the "feminist" model, which combines aspects of the other models; the new twist is "sisterliness."

1. The "male-model" is based on an assumption that women must beat men at their own game on male terms in order to prove their worth (Staines, Jayarative, Travis, 1974). As a woman federal appellate court judge recently stated: "In order for the few women now on the bench to gain needed respect for all women, we must not only perform as well as, but better than our male counterparts..." (Kennedy, 1977). Advocates of the male model contend that, as long as women strive to project the traditional feminine image to their co-workers, they will remain bound to all the attendant traditions

of powerlessness that they are attempting to escape (Meny, 1979). Ambitious women must adopt the same modes of behavior that have led to success for men: They should establish a "mentor connection" (Sheehy, 1976); they should "dress for success" (Malloy, 1980); they should generally subordinate their personal lives and sensitivities to their professional goals (Ramsey, Delene, and Sanders, 1980). In effect, they must join the "rat race" to get the same rewards (as well as penalties) that men do. One of the most obvious problems for women who adopt this model is the necessity, often, to be "superwomen," if they also marry, have children, and assume many of the traditional female responsibilities for the home (Boles, 1981). Only women with great drive, energy, and good fortune can play these dual roles without serious conflict (Stoper, 1977; Lee, 1977).

2. The essential feature of the "feminine" model is a set of behaviors congruent with traditional definitions of femininity. For example, a managerial woman who adopts this model will wait passively to be noticed and promoted by her male superiors. She will focus on doing a superior job, but she will be reluctant to assert herself. Consequently, she may become the "woman-behind-the-man," in much the same way that wives of successful men have historically provided services behind the scenes while their husbands take the public credit (Papanek, 1973).

Some women who adopt this model remain marginal in "man's world," because they restrict their aspirations or deliberately choose non-demanding or less competitive positions. They may "fear success" (Horner, 1958); they may even prefer the pink collar ghettos of sex-segregated jobs which provide them some degree of status, independence, and income. Their work essentially supports male superiors.

A few women in male-dominated fields maintain an outward appearance of femininity, reassuring to their colleagues, by their style of dress, by "mothering" their co-workers, or by otherwise espousing the virtues of femininity while covertly exercising a masculine-style power and authority. Perhaps the most well-known example of this is Phyllis Schlafly. While she begins each political speech by thanking her husband for "allowing" her to be present, she is one of the most powerful women in politics today.

Women who follow the "feminine model" must be very careful or they will not be taken seriously; they may be exploited by others or resented for their successes because of an assumption of preferential treatment. Feminine behavior patterns and appearances, when followed in a traditionally male environment, may be regarded as signs of professional imcompetence or as efforts at manipulation for advantage.

3. The "feminist model" is one which attempts—sometimes poorly, other times well—to combine the best aspects of the other two models. Feminist militancy, for example, is very much like male aggression, but with strong political overtones and an open urge for group power, not individual pay-off. Ideals of sisterhood, on the other hand, clearly require the traditional feminine attribute of nurturing. The feminist position stresses egalitarianism, and authority based on rank in the organization is forbidden or minimized. However, as Jo Freeman (1978) points out, the structurelessness of egalitarianism can become a way of masking power. No group can remain totally structureless. If no formal leadership is designated, informal leadership emerges. When the structure is informal, the rules of decision-making are known only to an elite few. Power is wielded by those who know the rules. The elite do not necessarily constitute a conspiracy. They may simply be friends, but because they form a clique, their stamp of approval is required before a "consensus" decision can be made. Thus, the feminist goal of equal power to all can result in an informal kind of tyranny by the elite group of friends who effectively shut out those who aren't part of their circle. Because this

power is not defined, there are no rules for accountability nor ways of redistributing power. Some people have concluded that this lack of structured power and authority is one reason that feminist organizations have not been seen as effective politically as anti-feminist organizations (Jo Freeman, 1975 and 1978; Boles, 1977; B. Freeman, 1980 and 1981).

Discussion

Each of these models has, in addition to the inherent problems already discussed, two major limitations: First, any confining set of "accepted" or "required" behaviors restricts individual choice and freedom. It does no good to exchange one set of stereotyped sex-role expectations for another equally restrictive set of expectations. To be truly "liberated," individual professional women must be free to choose the modes of organizational behavior most in keeping with their own personalities and ambitions. A much wider range of behavior patterns must become acceptable to both men and women (Heilbrun, 1973).

Second, the models described are primarily reactions to male-defined concepts of power and authority, rather than new formulations based on women's experience of power. The "male-model" incorporates male standards wholesale; the "feminine-model" retains much of the traditional submissiveness of women; the "feminist-model" is so focused on rejecting male standards that it can become dysfunctional.

As matters exist today, women must respond to men's conceptions of power and authority because men control access to most social, political, and economic resources needed to exert power. Before women can be free to choose behaviors, they must develop independent and direct access to these essential resources. As long as they are dependent on men for these resources, women must continue to emphasize the things men want most from them and can't get from other men: sex, motherhood, and service (Lipman-Blumen, 1976).

Recommendations

Women can doubtless begin to develop independent access to power resources in many ways. The following strategies seem particularly promising: 1) more effective use of the political forum; 2) increased efforts at "networking"; and 3) continued development of feminist humor as a bonding mechanism. These three techniques have a common thread: They require women to bond together, to support other women directly, and to act assertively to gain prestige, status, and authority for women in the public sphere.

The political forum is a major resource in our democratic society. Access to the public forum is a means to political and legal power, which is the most important realm of power for determining the legal conditions of life. Legislation that creates or bars access to resources is developed within the political forum. The absolute necessity of having more women in politics and the effect this can have on increasing women's access to resources is demonstrated by the fact that the ERA, the ERA extension, the Equal Pay Act, the Rape Privacy Act, the Displaced Homemakers Act, and battered spouse legislation were all introduced, sponsored, and shepherded through Congress by women (Shreve and Clemons, 1980). Yet politics, especially at the national level, is still an almost exclusively male domain. One major reason that more women are not elected is that women political candidates face tremendous obstacles in raising funds to run effective campaigns. "Women must learn to write checks for other women."

Women must also continue to expand and strengthen their networking efforts. It is one very effective way of coping with "tokenism," with being the only woman in the department. Women's networks provide support, but they must go beyond the personal to the political. "To network" is to create, deliberately and consciously, a formal and informal network of supportive relationships among women who share a particular interest or occupation. Networks are sometimes informal, based on personal contact and acquaintance ("good old girl" networks), but more and more frequently, they are formally organized with membership requirements, newsletters, funding sources, and even their own publication lists (Welch, 1980). The basic idea is that women must help one another in order to achieve greater status and power for all women. An example of the political effectiveness of networks follows: Two years ago, the Michigan lobbyist for NOW was told by a state legislator that women's issues were not important to his constituency. She then rallied the support of women's organizations in his district, including NOW, AAUW, and the League of Women Voters. Needless to say, the Senator's door was open the next time she came lobbying.

Finally, women need to develop a habit of using feminist humor. Students of humor tell us that humor is something that occurs among equals, that acts as a bonding mechanism, and that permits aggression or even hostility to be expressed in a socially acceptable manner (Schutz, 1979; Marlowe, 1980). A basic feature of the male camaraderie that underlies the "good ole boy network" is the aggressive use of humor. Unfortunately, women are generally excluded from this particular style of bonding and indeed are often the objects of "humorous" hostility. Conventional male humor often excludes and denigrates women and, in fact, women—especially feminists—are commonly accused of lacking a sense of humor. Professional women who find themselves in situations where men colleagues are putting them down in an overtly humorous, but covertly hostile, manner are often at a loss for a response. Perhaps they need to learn to respond in kind. Feminist humor refutes the notion that women have no sense of humor by turning the table on "conventional patriarchic humor" (Marlowe, 1980) and making men the butt of jokes (e.g., "Women Who Seek to be Equal to Men Lack Ambition"). The humor lies in the assertion of the superiority of women to men, in stark contrast to the implicit reference to women's actual social inferiority. The intention is aggressive; the effect is to unite women against a common enemy. Feminist humor, used deliberately and effectively, can encourage all women to violate tradition and exert organizational authority and power (Friedensohn, 1980). Who knows? It might even help to recruit women who are threatened by more overt displays of feminist militancy°

REFERENCES

Adams, Virginia. "Jane Crow in the Army," Psychology Today (October 1980), p. 56.

Bird, Caroline. Born Female. New York: David McKay, 1968.

Boles, Janet. The Politics of the ERA. New York: Longman, Inc., 1979.

Boles, Janet. "Political Woman as Superwoman: Sex Stereotyping of Females in Elected Office." A paper presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Annual Conference. Cincinnati, Ohio, 1981.

Carnegie Corporation of New York Annual Report. "Women Working Toward a New Society." 1976.

Easton, David. "The Perception of Authority and Political Change," Carl Friedrich (ed), Authority. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958, p. 182.

Freeman, Bonnie Cook. "The Reaction to Women's Liberation: Women Against Women." A paper presented at the National Women's Studies Association Convention, Bloomington, Indiana, May 1980.

Freeman, Jo. "The Tyranny of Structurelessness," Jane Jacquette (ed), Women in Politics. New York: John Wiley and Sons, inc. 1978, pp. 202-214.

Friedensohn, Doris. Presentation for the opening panel, "From our Work and Experience: Questions for the Academy," Toward a Feminist Transformation of the Academy: II, proceedings of the Sixth Annual GLCA Women's Studies Conference. Great Lakes Colleges Association, 1981.

Gehlen, F.L. "Women Members of Congress: A Distinctive Role," M. Githerns and J. Prestage (eds.), A Portrait of Marginality. New York: David McKay, 1977.

Gove, Walter, and Jeannette Tudor. "Adult Sex Roles and Mental Illness," Joan Huber (ed), Changing Women in a Changing Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973.

Heilbrun, Carolyn. Toward a Recognition of Androgyny. New York: Harper and Row, 1974.

Horner, Matina. "Femininity and Successful Achievement: A Basic Inconsistency," E. Walker (ed), Feminine Personality and Conflict. Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co., 1970.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. "You Don't Have To Play By Their Rules," Ms. Magazine, (October 1979), p. 63.

Kay, Susan. "Faculty Evaluation: Sex Bias in Students' Responses," News for Teachers of Political Science, 23 (Fall 1979), pp. 17-19.

Kennedy, Cornelia. A speech given at the National Women's Conference, Distinguished Women in Government Series, Houston, Texas, November 19, 1977.

Lee, Marcia. "Why Few Women Hold Public Office: Democracy and Sexual Roles," Political Science Quarterly, 9 (Summer 1976).

Lipman-Blumen, Jean. "Toward a Homosocial Theory of Sex Roles," M. Blaxall and B. Reagan (eds.) Women and the Workplace. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976.

Liss, L. "Why Academic Women Do Not Revolt: Implications for Affirmative Action," Sex Roles (1975), p. 216.

Lynn, Naomi, and Cornelia Flora, "Societal Punishment and Aspects of Female Political Participation: 1972 National Convention Delegates," M. Githens and J. Prestage (eds.), A Portrait of Marginality. New York: David McKay, 1977.

Malloy, John T. *Detroit Free Press*, weekly column.

Marlowe, Leigh. "Toward a Feminist Humor." A paper presented at the Seventh Annual National Conference on Feminist Psychology of the Association for Women in Psychology, San Francisco, California, 1980.

Martin, Elaine. "Power and Authority in the Classroom: Sexist Stereotypes in Teaching Evaluations." A paper presented at the National Women's Studies Association Annual Convention, Bloomington, Indiana, May 1980.

Meny, Enid. "Professor Says Femininity May Block Career Success," *New York Times*, (September 14, 1979), p. B-6.

Papanek, Hannah. "Men, Women and Work: Reflections on the Two-Person Career," J. Huber (ed), *Changing Women in a Changing Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973.

Ramsey, V., L. Delen, and M. Sanders. "Strategies for Professional Success: A Positive Review." A workshop presented at the First Annual Woman Researcher Conference, Kalamazoo, Michigan, September 1980.

Roper Organization, Inc. *The 1980 Virginia Slims American Women's Opinion Poll*, p. 42.

Schutz, Charles E. "The Phallic Fallacy: Political Potency in Feminist Humor." A paper presented at the Second International Conference on Humor, Los Angeles, California, May 1979.

Sheehy, Gail. "The Mentor Connection," *New York Magazine*, (April 5, 1976), pp. 33-39.

Shreve, Anita, and John Clemons. "Women in Politics," *New York Times Magazine* (October 19, 1980) p. 31.

Staines, Graham, Toby Jayarative, and Carol Travis. "The Queen Bee Syndrome," *Psychology Today*, 8 (1974), pp. 55-60.

Stoper, Emily. "Wife and Politician: Role Strain Among Women in Public Office," M. Githens and J. Prestage (eds.), *A Portrait of Marginality*. New York: David McKay, 1977.

Welch, Mary Scott. "Networking on the Job," *Ms. Magazine* (March 1980).

WOMEN AND WORK: THE MANAGERIAL IMPASSE

Robin L. Bartlett and Charles Poulton-Callahan, Denison University

Since World War II, the participation of women in the work force has increased by 19.2 percent.[1] In 1947, 31.8 percent of the female labor force was employed. Table 1 shows that the highest labor force participation rate for women occurred between the ages of 18 and 19 years. By 1979, the age-labor force participation rate for women exceeded 50 percent. The age-labor force participation profile of women had also changed—peak participation occurred between the ages of 20 to 24 years and continued at elevated levels until age 65.

The latest age-labor force participation profile is a result of a series of changes occurring over three decades.[2] The first change in labor force participation occurred in the mid-fifties as older women began reentering the labor market after their children were raised. The information in Table 2 illustrates this trend. In the mid-sixties, a new cohort of women began entering the job market. The labor force participation of women with children between the ages of 6 and 18 years increased markedly. Technological change, which reduced the time necessary for household chores, allowed women to enter the labor market and pursue higher wages generated by an over-heated war economy.[3] Increased productivity in the home, fewer children, and expanded job opportunities in the rapidly expanding clerical and service occupations coaxed mothers out of the home. By the time the mid-seventies arrived, the pull of market forces, luring housewives away from traditional roles, had become a shove. Double-digit inflation and record unemployment rates necessitated the evolution of the two-earner family. For many families, the decision for the wife to work was no longer an option. As a result, the fastest growing group of new entrants into the labor market during the seventies was mothers with children under 6 years of age.[4]

---

[1] U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, Manpower Report of the President (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1979); U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Employment and Earnings, January 1980 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office).

[2] U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Employment and Earnings, January 1980; Beverly L. Johnson, "Marital and Family Characteristics of the Labor Force, March 1979," in Monthly Labor Review, April 1980, p. 51.

[3] Robert W. Bednarzik and Deborah P. Klein, "Labor Force Trends: A Synthesis and Analysis," in Monthly Labor Review, October 1977, pp. 3-12

[4] U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Employment and Training Report of the President, 1979; Beverly L. Johnson, "Marital and Family Characteristics of the Labor Force."

In contrast, labor force participation for men fell from 86.8 percent in 1947 to 77.9 percent in 1979, as shown in Table 3.[5] In 1947, the age-labor force participation profile of men peaked between the ages of 35 and 44 years. By 1979 the peak of the age-labor force participation profile for men had drifted toward younger men, as they are remaining in school longer, reaping the benefits of the additional education earlier, and older men are retiring earlier.

A recent study by Fullerton and Flaim (1977) projected labor force participation rates for men and women for 1980, 1985, and 1990.[7] Some of Fullerton and Flaim's projections are reproduced in Table 4. For 1980, the labor force participation rate projection for women is 48.4 percent. A comparison with the rates found in Table 1 shows that this project was surpassed in 1979. In fact, the Department of Labor's projection for 1990 has already been realized. Projected labor force participation rates for men seem more on target. The 80's will no doubt witness a continued growth in the labor force participation rates of women, as inflation continues to erode family purchasing power. Male labor force participation will probably continue its slow decline due to "more and better pension programs, increased social security coverage and benefit levels, and the greater availability of disability insurance."[8] Moreover, "more equal employment opportunities, higher educational attainment, and postponed childbearing among women will likely make their worklife pattern more closely resemble those of men."[9]

The increased labor force participation of women has not substantially altered their market position. For example, despite equal pay and opportunity legislation, several executive orders, and affirmative action attempts, women continue to enter traditionally defined female occupations. As can be seen in Table 5, women constitute a majority of all clerical workers, private household workers, sewers and stitchers, dressmakers, shoemakers, elementary school teachers, and registered nurses.[10] In some areas—such as bookkeeping, cashiering, and sales clerking—the concentration of female workers has dramatically increased.

Women have made modest gains in some traditionally male occupations over the past 20 years.[11] Table 6 shows that an increasing number of women have become accountants, drafters, lawyers, and judges. The percentage of women who are engineers has tripled from .8 percent in 1960 to 2.9 percent in 1979. Large gains are easily registered, however, from such humble beginnings. Similarly, the percentage of women who are pharmacists is substantially larger.

---

[5] U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, Manpower Report of the President, 1973; U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Employment and Training Report of the President, 1979; and U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Employment and Earnings, January 1980.

[6] Don Bellante and Mark Jackson, Labor Economics: Choice in Labor Markets (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979).

[7] Howard J. Fullerton and Paul O. Flaim, "New Labor Force Projections to 1990," Monthly Labor Review, December 1976, pp. 3-13.

[8] Bednarzik and Klein, "Labor Force Trends: A Synthesis and Analysis," p. 8.

[9] Ibid.

[10] U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Census of Population, 1970, "Detailed Characteristics. PC(1) - D1. U.S. Summary" (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973); Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Employment and Earnings, January 1980

[11] Ibid.

However, women have not made substantial gains within the managerial occupations. Table 7 indicates some increase in the numbers of women who are bank officials and financial managers; public administration inspectors; officials of lodges, societies, and unions; and elementary and secondary school administrators. The percentage of women sales managers, except in retail sales, has grown from less than 1 percent in 1960 to over 8 percent in 1979, "one of the sharpest changes observed."[12] Nonetheless, women are located on the bottom rung of most organization ladders. Reagan notes that "a higher proportion of women than men counted in the management category serve as supervisors, rather than true managers."[13] According to Kanter, first line supervisory jobs are dead end.[14] To have power and thus stature within the company, middle management has to be infiltrated by women. Moreover, promotional opportunities available to managers in general are directly related to the size of the corporation and its market power. Women managers tend to be in smaller, less well-known companies.[15]

The influx of women into traditionally female jobs and the slight gains made in traditionally male occupations have resulted in a continued constant earnings gap.[16] Beller notes that if women had not made these gains, the earnings gap may have widened between 1967 and 1974.[17] Table 8 presents median wage and salary income data for full-time year-round workers between 1963 and 1978.[18] Women, on average, earned 59 percent of what male workers earned over the period. The earnings gap between male and female workers decreased slightly in 1978. Whether the earnings gap decrease is a statistical observation or a new trend depends on whether women make deeper inroads into the higher paying managerial and professional ranks in the future. Female managers are actually contributing to the widening of the earnings gap. For example, in 1978 women managers, on average, earned 54 percent of what male managers earned, an income below the overall national average. The earnings gap between male and female professionals was 55 percent—also below the national average. Gaining entry into managerial positions is not enough to insure wage gains.[19] Pifer notes that several "limitations on (women's) upward mobility are still prevalent."[20] Women are denied superior entry-level positions, further on-the-job training, and access to other avenues of upward mobility.[21] Whether women make significant wage gains within the managerial ranks depends on their overcoming these limitations.

---

[12] Barbara B. Reagan, "De Facto Job Segregation," in American Women Workers in a Full Employment Economy, Joint Economic Committee (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1977, p. 97).
[13] Ibid.
[14] Rosabeth Moss Kanter, Men and Women of the Corporation (New York: Basic Books, 1977, p. 186).
[15] Reagan, "De Facto Job Segregation."
[16] Excess supply tends to depress wages and salaries. See Dixie Somers, "Occupations Rankings for Men and Women by Earnings," in Monthly Labor Review, August 1974, pp. 34-51.
[17] Andrea H. Beller, "The Impact of Equal Employment Opportunity Laws of the Male-Female Earnings Differential," in Women in the Labor Market, Cynthia B. Lloyd, Emily S. Andrews, and Curtis L. Gilroy, eds. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1979).
[18] U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Current Population Report, Series P-60, numbers 43, 47, 51, 53, 60, 66, 75, 80, 85, 90, 97, 101, 105, 114, 118, and 123 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office).
[19] Alan Pifer, "Women Working Toward a New Society," in Urban and Social Change Review, V. 11, No. 1-2, 1978.
[20] Ibid.
[21] Ibid.

Women managers face both informal and formal limitations. Statistical discrimination or myths about women and work are the major informal barriers. It is generally assumed that a married woman's primary commitment is to her family and not her career.[22] Employers thus assume that women will have higher quit and absenteeism rates than men. Employers also assume that women will have shorter worklives than men. However, the statistical evidence shows that: (1) if job status and pay are identical, women are no more likely to quit their jobs than their male counterparts;[23] (2) when job status and level are controlled, absenteeism rates for men and women are similar;[24] and (3) at the age of 35 years, the worklife expectancy of men and women is the same.[25] Lloyd and Niemi note that until stereotypes are ignored, the "individual woman" will continue to find substantial barriers, however great her ability and commitment, to acquiring the quality of job experience necessary to realize her potential."[26]

Formal barriers can be equally damaging to women's managerial careers. The corporate structure is designed to maximize efficient decision making and short-term profits. Pyramiding managerial jobs means increasing competition after each promotion. In addition, male managers are more likely to do the bare minimum to comply with federal guidelines to minimize costs.[27] Thus, female managers' climb up the corporate ladder is long and arduous. The evidence shows that neither requisite training nor initiative and drive are sufficient to place women on an equal footing with male managers.[28] The corporate structure, with all of its male nuances and culture, is an environment in which female managers can easily make fatal career mistakes.[29]

---

[22] National Manpower Council, Womanpower (New York: Columbia Univrsity Press, 1957); Reagan, "De Facto Job Segregation."

[23] Francis D. Blau and Lawrence M. Kahn, "Race and Sex Differences in the Probability and Consequences of Voluntary Turnover," a paper presented at the North American Meetings of the Econometrics Society, Chicago, August 1978.

[24] Ibid. See also Greg J. Duncan and Richard D. Coe, "Absenteeism, Statistical Discrimination and the Wages of Men and Women," unpublished paper, University of Michigan, 1979; and Gerald P. Glyde, "Under-employment of Women: Policy Implications for a Full Employment Economy," in American Women Workers in a Full Employment Economy (Washington, D.C.: Joint Economics Committee, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977).

[25] Mary Dublin Keyserling, "Women's Stake in Full Employment: Their Disadvantaged Role in the Economy—Challenges to Action," in American Women Workers in a Full Employment Economy, Joint Economic Committee, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1977).

[26] Cynthia B. Lloyd and Beth T. Niemi, The Economics of Sex Differentials (New York: Columbia University Press, 1979, p. 13).

[27] Margaret V. Higgenson and Thomas L. Quick, The Ambitious Woman's Guide to a Successful Career (New York: AMACOM, 1980).

[28] Pifer, "Women Working: Toward a New Society"; Reagan, "De Facto Job Segregation"; Judith Long Laws, "Psychological Dimensions of Labor Force Participation of Women," in Equal Employment Opportunity and the AT&T Case, Phyllis Wallace, ed. (Cambridge, Massachusetts: M.I.T. Press, 1976).

[29] Betty Lehan Harragan, Games Mother Never Taught You (New York: Warner Books, Inc., 1977).

Yet corporate environments can change and change very rapidly if the right pressure is put on them. Responses of major corporations to deregulation and foreign competition provide excellent examples.[30]

American Telephone and Telegraph (AT&T), the nation's largest corporate entity, used to pride itself in providing service to customers. The costs associated with providing excellent service were simply passed along to the consumer in rate hikes. The Federal Communications Commission, however, decided to allow other companies to sell products in the formerly monopolized markets of AT&T. The corporation had to change both its services orientation and its profits. AT&T set new corporate goals, brought in new managerial role models (innovative managers willing to try new ideas), and changed the reward structure of the company. Practically overnight, AT&T became a marketing-oriented firm, sensitive to the needs of its customers.

Pepsi Cola provides another example. The Board of Directors of Pepsi decided that they were tired of losing sales to Coca Cola. Pepsi also began the process of setting new corporate goals, bringing in innovators, and revamping the reward system. Coke's inroads into Pepsi's market soon diminished.

These cases show that large corporations can change when threatened by economic loss. Costs levied on corporations who fail to hire and promote women are minimal compared to the losses they envision when their markets are threatened. However, if every woman stopped using the telephone or buying Pepsi Cola, the threat to corporate profits would be ominous

Corporate change must come from the top. If long-term goals are developed, short-term profits become less significant. The challenge is to provide corporation executives with convincing evidence that, over the long haul, the equal inclusion of women will prove more profitable than maintaining the current barriers to their inclusion. Role models must continue to be brought into the corporate structure through existing affirmative action plans, but the reward structure has to parallel these efforts. Managers who train women well should be rewarded through faster promotions or higher pay. Unless aiding women through the corporate maze enhances the career opportunities of male managers, the additional competition of women managers will not be welcomed. Much can be learned by examining corporate responses to a variety of intrusions into their markets.

---

[30] Business Week, "Corporate Culture: The Hard-to-Change Values that Spell Success or Failure," October 27, 1980, pp. 148-160.

Table 1 - Civilian Labor Force Participation Rates[1] of Women by Age, 1947 to 1979

Participation Rates

Women	1947	1950	1955	1960	1965	1970	1975	1979
16 years and over	31.8	33.9	35.7	37.7	39.3	43.3	46.3	51.0
16 to 17 years	29.5	30.1	28.9	29.1	27.7	34.9	40.2	45.8
18 to 19 years	52.3	51.3	50.9	50.9	49.3	53.6	58.1	62.9
20 to 24 years	44.9	46.0	45.9	46.1	49.9	57.7	64.1	69.1
25 to 34 years	32.0	34.0	34.9	36.0	38.5	45.0	54.6	63.8
35 to 44 years	36.3	39.1	41.6	43.4	46.1	51.1	55.8	63.6
45 to 54 years	32.7	37.9	43.8	49.8	50.9	54.4	54.6	58.4
55 to 64 years	24.3	27.0	32.5	37.2	41.1	43.0	41.0	41.9
65 years and over	8.1	9.7	10.6	10.8	10.0	9.7	8.3	8.3

[1] Percent of civilian noninstitutional population in the civilian force.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, *Report of the President* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973); U.S. Department of Labor, *Employment and Training Report of the President* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1979; and U.S. Departmnt of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Employment and Earnings*, January 1980 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1980).

Table 2 - Labor Force Participation Rates of Women by Marital Status and Age of Children[1] in April 1948, March 1950, April 1955, March 1960, 1965, 1970, 1975 and 1979.

Marital Status	1948	1950	1955	1960	1965	1970	1975	1979
Married women-husband present	22.0	23.8	27.7	30.5	34.7	40.8	44.4	49.4
With children under 6 years	10.8	11.0	16.2	18.6	23.2	30.3	36.6	43.2
With children 6 to 17 yrs. only	26.0	28.3	34.7	39.0	42.7	49.2	52.3	59.1
Women maintaining familes[2]						52.9		59.5
With children under 6 years						46.9		56.1
With children 6 to 17 yrs. only						67.0		71.6
With no children under 18 yrs.						45.8		48.8

---

[1] Children are defined as "own" children of husband-wife families or of women or men maintaining families. Included are never-married sons, daughters, step-children and adopted children. Excluded are other related children such as grandchildren, nieces, nephews, cousins, and unrelated children.

[2] Includes only divorced, separated, widowed, or never-married persons.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Report of the President (Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979); Beverly L. Johnson: "Marital and Family Characteristics of the Labor Force, March 1979," Monthly Labor Review, April 1980, p. 51 (U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington D.C.).

Table 3 - Civilian Labor Force Participation Rates[1] of Men by Age, 1947 to 1979

Participation Rates

Men	1947	1950	1955	1960	1965	1970	1975	1979
16 years and over	86.8	86.4	85.3	83.3	80.7	79.7	77.9	77.9
16 to 17 years	52.2	51.3	48.1	46.0	43.9	47.0	48.6	51.6
18 to 19 years	80.5	75.9	72.2	69.3	65.9	66.7	70.7	72.1
20 to 24 years	84.9	87.9	86.8	88.1	85.8	83.3	84.6	86.6
25 to 34 years	95.8	96.0	97.6	97.5	97.3	96.4	95.3	95.4
35 to 44 years	98.0	97.6	98.1	97.7	97.3	96.9	95.6	95.8
45 to 54 years	95.5	95.8	96.5	95.7	95.6	94.2	92.1	91.4
55 to 64 years	89.6	86.9	87.9	86.8	84.6	83.0	75.8	73.0
65 years and over	47.8	45.8	39.6	33.1	27.9	26.8	21.7	20.0

[1] Percent of civilian noninstitutional population in the civilian labor force.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Report of the President (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973); U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Report of the President (Washington, D.C.: Government PrintingOffice, 1979; and U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Employment and Earnings, January 1980 (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1980).

Table 4 - Civilian Noninstitutional Labor Force Participation Rate by Age and Sex Projected 1980, 1985, and 1990.

Sex and age group	Civilian labor force participation rates, annual averages (percent of population in labor force)		
	Projected		
MEN	1980	1985	1990
Total, 16 years and over	77.8	77.5	77.3
16 to 19 years	61.0	60.9	61.3
16 and 17 years	50.6	50.7	50.8
18 and 19 years	71.8	71.4	71.4
20 to 24 years	84.2	83.0	82.1
25 to 34 years	95.2	94.9	94.7
35 to 44 years	95.5	95.1	94.8
45 to 54 years	91.2	90.6	90.2
55 to 64 years	74.3	71.6	69.9
55 to 59 years	83.7	82.5	81.6
60 to 64 years	63.1	59.9	57.7
65 years and over	19.9	18.0	16.8
65 to 69 years	30.1	28.0	26.6
70 years and over	13.3	11.8	10.7

Table 4 continued: Civilian Noninstitutional Labor Force

Participation Rates by Age and Sex

Project 1980, 1985, and 1990.

Sex and age group	Civilian labor force participation rates, annual averages (percent of population in labor force)		
	Projected		
	1980	1985	1990
Total, 16 years and over	48.4	50.3	51.4
16 to 19 years	51.8	53.6	55.2
16 and 17 years	43.1	45.4	46.9
18 and 19 years	60.0	61.5	62.5
20 to 24 years	68.4	72.5	75.2
25 to 34 years	57.4	61.2	63.5
35 to 44 years	58.3	61.1	63.0
45 to 54 years	57.1	59.1	60.3
55 to 64 years	41.9	42.2	42.3
55 to 59 years	49.2	50.4	51.0
60 to 64 years	33.7	33.7	33.7
65 years and over	8.1	7.8	7.6
65 to 69 years	14.6	14.3	14.2
70 years and over	4.7	4.5	4.4

Source: Howard N. Fulerton, Jr., and Paul O. Flaim, "New Labor Force Projections to 1990," Special Labor Force Report 197, U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977).

Table 5 - Women as a Percentage of Selected Detailed Occupations for the Years 1960, 1970, and 1979.

Occupation	1960[1]	1970	1979
All occupations	32.8	37.7	41.7
Librarians	85.4	79.2	80.9
Registered Nurses	97.5	97.3	96.8
Elementary School Teachers	85.8	83.6	84.3
Prekindergarten and Kindergarten Teachers	100.0	97.9	97.4
Bookkeepers	83.4	82.0	91.9
Cashiers	76.9	83.5	87.9
Office Machines Operators	74.4	74.0	74.9
Shoemaking Machine Operators	58.2	60.9	77.3
Secretaries	97.1	97.6	99.1
Stenographers	95.7	93.8	93.4
Typists	95.1	93.8	93.4
Demonstrators	93.2	91.1	93.2
Sales Clerks, Retail Trade	63.3	64.6	70.7
Dressmakers and Seamstresses (except factory)	96.7	95.0	—
Dressmakers (except factory)	—	—	95.4
Sewers and Stitchers	94.0	93.7	95.3
Private Household Workers	96.4	96.6	97.6
Waitresses	86.6	88.8	89.4

[1] Workers are 14 years of age and over for 1960 and 1970 and they are 16 years of age for 1979.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Population, "Detailed Characteristics of the Population, PC(1)-D1, U.S. Summary." (Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973); U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Employment and Earnings, January 1980 (Washington, D.C.; U.S. Government Printing Office).

Table 6 - Women as a Percentage of Selected Male-Dominated Detailed Professions for the Years 1960, 1979, and 1979.

Occupations	1960	1970	1979[1]
All Occupations	32.80	37.70	41.70
Accountants	16.50	26.20	32.90
Architects	2.10	3.60	6.00
Computer Programmers	26.70	22.70	29.00
Computer Systems Analysts	22.20	14.80	24.30
Drafters	5.60	8.00	14.80
Engineers	.83	1.60	2.90
Aeronautical and Astronautical	1.60	1.70	1.60
Civil	.58	1.30	2.50
Electrical	.79	1.70	2.20
Industrial	1.80	3.00	7.30
Mechanical	.34	.94	1.30
Lawyers and Judges	3.40	4.90	12.40
Lawyers	2.40	4.80	12.80
Pharmacists	7.50	12.00	24.40
Physicians, Medical and Osteopathic	6.90	9.30	10.70
Dentists	2.30	3.50	4.60
Clergy	2.30	2.90	4.60
Economists	13.20	11.40	24.40
Chemists	7.90	12.10	15.20

---

[1] Workers are 14 years of age and over for 1960 and 1970, and they are 16 years of age and over for 1979.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Population, "Detailed Characteristics of the Population, PC(1)-D1, U.S. Summary." (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973); U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Employment and Earnings, January 1980 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office).

Table 7 - Women as a Percentage of Selected Detailed Managerial Workers for Years 1960, 1970, and 1979.

Occupation	1960[1]	1970	1979
All Occupations	32.80	37.7	41.7
Managers and Administrators (except farm)	14.70	16.5	24.6
Bank Officials and Financial Managers	8.70	17.6	31.6
Buyers, Wholesale and Retail Trade	35.50	29.5	40.0
Health Administrators	75.10	44.6	48.1
Inspectors, Except Construction; Public Administration	4.60	7.2	12.5
Officials and Administrator; Public Administration; n.e.c.	17.40	19.1	26.6
Restaurants, Cafeteria, and Bar Managers	32.50	34.1	35.4
Sales Managers and Department Heads, Retail Trade	23.40	23.8	39.8
Sales Managers, Except Retail Trade	.08	3.5	8.6
School Administrators, College	30.70	23.5	32.8
School Administrators, Elementary and Secondary	25.00	27.1	37.5

[1] Workers are 14 years of age and over for 1960 and 1970; they are 16 years of age for 1979.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Population, "Detailed Characteristics of the Population, PC(1)-D2, U.S. Summary." (Washington, D.C.: U.S.Government Printing Office, 1973); U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Employment and Earnings, January 1980 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printng Office).

Table 8 - Median Wage and Salary Income for Full-Time Year-Round Workers

1963	M	7713	7639	5838	6493	6315	5480	—	4399	4449	750	1655	5978	
	F	4998	4219	3951	2531	—	3143	1108	2528	—	—	—	3561	.60
1964	M	8004	7870	6134	6733	6538	5659	—	4701	4436	754	2160	6195	
	F	5150	4369	4060	2719	—	3271	1082	2525	—	—	—	3690	.60
1965	M	8464	8856	6231	7188	6877	5830	—	4986	4445	750	2468	6375	
	F	5634	9593	4154	2961	4023	3327	1150	2607	—	—	—	3823	.60
1966	M	8945	9103	6487	7569	6197	6112	—	5078	4946	1224	2489	6848	
	F	5826	4919	4316	3103	4315	3416	1297	2815	—	—	—	3973	.58
1967	M	9523	9817	6757	7744	7484	6316	—	5439	5182	993	2489	7193	
	F	6307	5341	4537	3283	4284	3649	1298	3071	—	—	—	4260	.59
1968	M	10151	10340	7351	8459	7978	6738	—	6058	5504	1275	3069	7748	
	F	6691	5635	4789	3161	4625	3991	1523	3332	—	—	—	4567	.59
1969	M	11266	11467	7966	9135	8756	7307	—	6373	6150	1180	2985	8894	
	F	7309	6091	5187	3704	4992	4317	1851	3755	—	—	—	5041	.57
1970	M	11806	12117	8617	9790	9354	7623	—	6955	6563	1260	3519	9015	
	F	7878	6834	5551	4188	5089	4510	2101	3953	4291	—	—	5385	.60
1971	M	12164	13015	9162	10588	4626	7894	—	7191	6970	1764	3665	9450	
	F	8346	7312	5718	4549	5449	4798	1981	4280	4520	—	1447	5688	.60
1972	M	13029	13741	9656	11356	10429	8701	—	7762	7535	2684	4461	10258	
	F	8796	7306	6039	4575	5731	5021	2365	4606	4755	—	—	5993	.58
1973	M	13945	14737	10619	12031	11308	9481	—	8112	8037	2403	4730	11186	
	F	9095	7998	6458	4674	6315	5420	2243	4745	5286	—	3923	6421	.57
1974	M	14453	15985	11498	12380	12094	10097	—	8724	8420	2731	5131	11874	
	F	9587	9195	6868	5114	6572	5895	2732	5206	6129	—	—	6897	.58
1975	M	15555	16598	12138	13787	12917	11106	—	9592	9134	2547	5300	12791	
	F	10627	9539	7564	5743	7336	6286	2556	5869	6829	—	—	7569	.59
1976	M	16401	17246	12778	14299	13708	11784	—	10131	10080	2010	6270	13533	
	F	11081	10177	8138	6350	7917	6696	2729	5969	7615	—	—	8171	.60
1977	M	18224	18086	13966	16067	14517	12612	—	10338	10824	5601	7278	14626	
	F	11995	9799	6825	8601	8902	7350	2714	6330	7441	—	—	8618	.59
1978	M	18270	19633	15289	16839	15776	13660	—	11057	12031	8985	6813	15750	
	F	10137	10689	9158	7644	954	8005	2830	7010	7452	—	—	9929	.63

[1] Gap is defined as women's earnings as a proportion of men's earnings.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Current Population Report, Series P-60, numbers 43, 47, 51, 53, 60, 66, 75, 80, 85, 90, 97, 101, 105, 114, 118, and 123 (Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office).

Table 9 - The Earnings Gap[1] Within Occupations for Full-Time, Year-Round Workers

1963	.65	.58	.68	.44	.57	—	—	.57	—	—	—
1964	.64	.56	.66	.39	.58	—	—	.54	—	—	—
1965	.67	.52	.67	.40	.57	.58	—	.52	—	—	—
1966	.65	.54	.67	.41	.56	.70	—	.55	—	—	—
1967	.66	.54	.65	.42	.59	.58	—	.56	—	—	—
1968	.66	.54	.65	.42	.59	.58	—	.55	—	—	—
1969	.65	.53	.65	.41	.59	.57	—	.59	—	—	—
1970	.68	.56	.64	.43	.59	.55	—	.57	.65	—	—
1971	.69	.56	.62	.43	.61	.57	—	.60	.65	—	—
1972	.68	.53	.62	.40	.58	.55	—	.59	.63	—	—
1973	.65	.54	.61	.39	.57	.56	—	.58	.66	—	—
1974	.64	.59	.60	.41	.58	.54	—	.60	.73	—	—
1975	.68	.57	.62	.42	.57	.57	—	.58	.75	—	—
1976	.67	.59	.64	.44	.57	.58	—	.59	.76	—	—
1977	.66	.54	.62	.42	.58	.61	—	.61	.69	—	—
1978	.55	.54	.60	.45	.59	.61	—	.63	.62	—	—

[1] Gap is defined as women's earnings as a proportion of men's earnings.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Current Population Report, Series P-60, numbers 43, 47, 51, 53, 60, 66, 75, 80, 85, 90, 97, 101, 105, 114, 118, and 123 (Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office).

THE CALL FOR FEMINIST THEORY:
WILL WE RECOGNIZE THE ANSWER?

(Response and Commentary to Martin, Bartlett, and Poulton-Callahan)

Joan Straumanis, Denison University

Because the papers in this section raise theoretical questions, I was asked to respond both to the papers and to the wider questions: What is feminist theory? How does the work we see here fit into that category? Those questions stimulated the following general speculations, at the conclusion of which is my response to the papers by Martin and Bartlett/Poulton-Callahan.

I have heard it said that there is no such thing as feminist theory. Whether or not we agree, we owe ourselves an answer to the question: What would a proper feminist theory look like? Would we know it when we see it? And what, if any, is the difference between feminist theorizing and feminist theory? People who would want to differentiate between these two would probably point to at least three distinguishing characteristics: 1) ORIGINALITY--application of theory already on hand versus invention of new theory; 2) SCOPE--piecemeal versus global; and 3) LEVEL OF ABSTRACTION--thinking about women versus thinking about theory.

Since feminist theorizing admits of so many variations, is pursued in several disciplines (in fact is the way in which many feminists pursue their own disciplines), can be contributed to by non-feminists, and indeed has been carried out to some degree even in the absence of an effective women's movement (e.g., by such people as Ashley Montague and Margaret Mead in the last generation), this can hardly be the kind of theory which some feminists feel is missing entirely from the literature. Even without a uniform criterion by which to test whether theorizing is "feminist," I think we could agree that a fair amount of recent work on women does meet reasonable standards--that is, can generally be regarded as "feminist." This would be especially true of research by motivated feminists, of course, but it might also apply to that part of the rest which has been liberating in effect--the work on human sexuality of Masters and Johnson, for example. Although we ought to campaign for more such work to be undertaken and taken seriously, and cannot begin to be satisfied with the proportion of research support being devoted to it, there is enough of it around so that we are fairly practiced at identifying it. This cannot be the elusive Feminist Theory that some would say has yet to be done.

Those who look forward to such theory appear to believe that some day some Big Mama will write a Whole Account of sexual inequality, its forms, causes, and cures, and that it will be instantly recognized as True (or "fruitful," as the more sophisticated would have it) by the entire feminist community.

It would embrace all issues in its complexity, unveil new perspectives by its originality, and convince all skeptics by the power of its vision. Such a view pictures feminism (or feminist studies) as a relatively self-contained research area (something like a discipline or a problem-set), and takes the future feminist theory to be similar to what Thomas Kuhn has called a paradigm: a unifying model or shared world view which explains data and directs research by setting standards for what count as researchable questions and acceptable solutions. A mature science (discipline), Kuhn says, is one which accepts a single paradigm that replaces all rivals. This paradigm then lasts long enough to be thoroughly articulated and to produce research results which are well enough entrenched to persist beyond the life span of the paradigm itself. The social sciences, and presumably the humanities, are troubled by a multiplicity of competing paradigms, each of which has its adherents, journals, vocabulary, and methods. Examples of paradigms at the disciplinary level are Darwinian evolutionary theory, behaviorism (in psychology), Freudianism, and Marxism. Some of the feminists with whom I have explored this question have said that they envision the Feminist Theory as analogous to Marxism--with the same breadth, coherence, explanatory power, and programmatic suggestiveness; in other words, they see it as a paradigm.

Assuming for a moment that the search for feminist theory is a search for a paradigm, what would this paradigm be like? I asked my students what they would demand of a "complete" feminist theory. Here is the list of required components that emerged from our discussion:

1) A DESCRIPTION (cross-cultural, historical, and contemporary) of what it is to be a human female.
2) An EXPLANATION of the origin and persistence of sexual inequality.
3) A feminist CRITIQUE of the contemporary situation of women. (Here my students would focus on our own society--the one most accessible to intervention.)
4) A BLUEPRINT for change (possibly including a vision of post-patriarchal life).

My students maintained that some such "complete theories" exist; they were even able to agree upon at least one--Shulamith Firestone's The Dialectic of Sex--which they believe meets their criteria.

Let us take this suggestion seriously: Could The Dialectic of Sex be the sought-after Feminist Theory? Does it provide a "paradigm" for feminism? Is Shulamith Firestone Big Mama? It seems not. A paradigm must be embraced by a community of scholars who find their vision of their work transformed by it. Firestone is widely recognized and admired, but I am not aware that her work has generated a community of adherents or believers. For example, her "explanation" of sexual inequality in terms of female reproductive biology and her recommendations for reform by medical technology may be worth considering, but by no means do they strike the majority of feminists as creditable. Since even a paradigm struggling for recognition requires that a group of advocates and practitioners consider themselves to be guided by it, Firestone's work appears to fail the test of acceptance demanded of a paradigm.

This difficulty equally disqualifies most other candidate paradigms in feminist theory. Few seem to command a large and loyal following, and virtually none appear to guide the research and practice of a community of scholars. Of course, many feminists are directed in their work by the accepted paradigms of their disciplines, and some have even developed feminist variants of such acknowledged paradigms as Freudianism and Marxism. Even when these modified theories differ substantially from the "papa" paradigms, being the products of rebellious daughters (Juliet Mitchell comes to mind), it is hard for many to accept them as feminist theory, related as they are to theories invented elsewhere for other purposes, some of which are inimical to feminism.

It may by now look as if I believe that the lack of a feminist paradigm is just the result of an inability of feminists to get together--to agree on a single story. If the lack of wide acceptance were all that stood in the way, the work of Firestone, or Mitchell, or Mary Daly, or whomever, could be the basis for a paradigm, if only the feminist community were more receptive to it.

I think the search for a feminist paradigm is misguided; feminism is not a discipline or a research program, but, as I shall argue, a normative lens. This lens is corrective of distortions in other theories and it discloses what was previously invisible, but feminists do not share a set of questions or methodologies--nor should they. Even our presuppositions and goals differ: Do we promote and celebrate the traditionally feminine because women are so different from men ("romantic" feminism)? Or do we seek a new androgynous world order based on the equality of women and men ("egalitarian" feminism)?

Is anything, then, common to all feminist theorizing? Is there any necessary condition which such work must meet to merit the name "feminist"? Well, at least all feminist theorizing is evaluative; it never merely describes or explains. It criticizes the patriarchal order, measuring it by standards inherent to a feminist point of view. Implicitly or inexplicitly, it seeks revision of social life and redistribution of power and benefits between men and women. Such considerations have led me to conclude that if there is to be a common feminist theory, a feminist "paradigm," it has to be a theory of ethics: Its role must be to justify a feminist normative vision of human life; it must establish the moral correctness of the feminist evaluation of the patriarchy, and the correctness of feminist efforts to replace it.

Perhaps, in addition, it ought to present a political and social theory in which the linkages between power and gender oppression are generalized to all power relationships--those of race, class, and nation, for example--but I submit that for an ethical theory to be feminist, it is not sufficient that a new view of gender relations be deducible from the principles. Rather the situations and needs of human females ought to be the starting point and the centerpiece of the theory, for to be a woman is not exactly like (nor entirely unlike) being a member of an ethnic minority or caste; and to be a female member of an ethnic minority is not exactly like being a male member. We should be suspicious of too high a level of generality: Feminism is not "just humanism."

Despite my conviction that the future Feminist Theory will be some sort of ethical theory, I think that it is essential, and in no way uncongenial with the generation of that theory, that all forms of feminist theorizing--in its rich, sometimes contradictory variety--continue and increase. I submit the following list of topics as suggestive--not exhaustive--of the forms that such theorizing could take:

- Explanation--accounting for the origins of sexual inequality by means of research in paleontology, archeology, ethnology, physiology, and anthropology; speculations about pre-history, such as "reconstructive anthropology" and feminist sociobiology (e.g., Susan Griffin's).
- Descriptive Analysis--of institutions, material conditions, symbol systems, social life; phenomenological accounts of women's experience.
- Prescriptive Theory--analysis/justification of political programs and strategies; utopian explorations (e.g., Charlotte Perkins Gilman's Herland); visionary science fiction (e.g., Marge Piercy's Woman on the Edge of Time).
- Ethics and Metaethics--contributions to the justification of feminism.
- Conceptual Analysis--for example, of such terms as "androgyny," "nymphomania".
- Generation of New Concepts/Models--for example, "math anxiety" (Tobias), "tokenism" (Kanter), "lesbian continuum" (Rich).
- Application of Disciplinary Theory.
- Problem-Centered Theorizing--e.g., about abortion.

This list reveals my permissive point of view: that "thinking hard about hard questions" constitutes theorizing. What, then, would be excluded? Empirical work which is simply descriptive, not analytical; literary expression; calls for action without accompanying justifications; slogans.

Is there some special relationship between the bits of theorizing suggested in my list and the overarching theory I believe that feminism demands? Certainly, the relationship would not be as parts to a whole: The Feminist Theory I envision could not be assembled from the work we now do in feminist studies. And neither could the pieces of what I have been calling "feminist theorizing" be generated from the theory. The relationship between feminist theory and feminist theorizing is that one would justify the other; in fact, it would make production of the other a moral imperative. Further, the successful theory would render competing non-feminist or anti-feminist theorizing unacceptable, since it would establish the moral necessity of feminism.

In summary, my position is that something different from the more-or-less piecemeal feminist theorizing we all try to do--something which could reasonably be called the feminist theory--has yet to be written, but could be written. It would speak at what philosophers call the "meta" level: theorizing not about women or social/political life, but about feminist theory itself. It would address such questions as: What makes feminist theory feminist? How is feminist theorizing to be justified? What is the moral justification of feminism itself? (Recall that the subtitle of Mary Daly's *Gyn/Ecology* is "The *Metaethics* of Radical Feminism.") In some small way, this paper is intended as a contribution to such metatheory.

Returning now to the accompanying papers, it seems clear that both qualify as examples of feminist theorizing.

The Bartlett/Poulton-Callahan piece on the "Managerial Impasse" uses the categories and methodology of an established discipline, economics, to analyze the "earnings gap" between men and women, giving detailed attention to the situation of managerial/professional workers. The message is that there is a widening earnings gap, which is greater than that for the labor force as a whole, in just those areas of employment in which we think we see the greatest progress for women in terms of increasing proportion of the work force. Professional/managerial women earn more than their worker sisters, but they are losing ground compared with their executive-level brothers.

The data are empirical, the methods of analysis are statistical, and the explanations are strongly discipline-oriented--even where my hunch is that the problem is too wide for one discipline to contain. For example, an analysis of inflationary pressures does not sufficiently explain the movement of women into and out of the labor force or into ghettoized job categories. At points in the paper I am confused about whether the economic forces being cited operate as causes or as effects (both?) in what is clearly a complex social movement. Do these authors see all phenomena--causes as well as effects--as economic? But surely, whatever results in "more employment opportunities, higher educational attainment and postponed childbearing" must involve social, psychological, and political, as well as economic forces. For example, would these changes have come about--and to what extent--without the women's movement?

The women's movement is not cited as a direct factor in their calculus, but the authors do cite work by at least one feminist sociologist (Rosabeth Kanter), and pay what I think is warranted attention to some of the popular "self-improvement" literature for women, a literature which is itself both a response to, and an accelerator of, the movement of women into the upper levels of the workforce.

In addition, the expository material in this paper, like much in the authors' discipline, is almost all attributed to others. It is hard to hear the authors' own voices. What does it take for an economist to earn the right to speak? Presumably they are convinced that the *citation* of an opinion carries more authority than does an opinion. But this is a problem for feminist scholarship where so much of what we must do is pioneering. We have too few predecessors, too small a community, to find the insights we need in the literature. Feminism is a bootstrap operation; we must believe in our own authority.

Elaine Martin's paper has a different purpose from the "Managerial Impasse" piece. I see it as an attempt to generate new theory--specifically, to design a classification scheme for the behavior of (again) female executives/professionals. She presents three behavioral "models" for women in authority:

a "masculine" model, a "feminine" model, and a "feminist" model, each of which is subjected to criticism. (Presumably these are descriptive, not prescriptive, models.)

But here is a problem: It is not clear from what normative stance her criticisms emerge. Is this a feminist critique? Is it a feminist critique of a cariacature of feminism? Or is Martin criticizing the inadequate realization of feminist principles? The paper could be strengthened by the clarification that a unified theory of feminist ethics would offer.

Both papers display some unacknowledged additional limitations of scope and vision. The role of "class" is central in economic life, and is strongly interactive with gender. Bartlett and Poulton-Callahan seem aware of this in their statistical summaries, but say little about it in their discussion. For example, the reasons why women return to the workforce probably differ dramatically according to their social class. Women in some socioeconomic and ethnic categories cannot "return" to the workforce--because they never left it!

Martin also does not deal with problems of class and does not indicate, for example, the difference between the situation of female workers in the so-called "pink-collar ghettos" (waitresses, food technicians, beauty-shop employees) and those in what are clearly white-collar female ghettos (secretaries, nurses, elementary school teachers). These in turn differ from the situations of female managers and professionals (the subjects of Martin's essay) who are confined to token roles within male-dominated structures. Each of these workers might have different reasons to choose to survive by displaying the "feminine" behavior described in Martin's second model, but these are all conflated within the single model.

Martin should also be challenged for the passages in which she implies that until recently "most women" played a "non-threatening, nurturing, subordinate role," confined to the home. As was pointed out above, most women of color and many white women have always been part of the labor force; female labor force participation has by no means been confined to "stereotypical hard-bitten, single, career women." The same passage also asserts that earlier generations of career women save up "sex" along with family life in order to work outside the home. Setting aside the fact that the claim itself is questionable (perhaps it was not meant literally), it appears to equate "sex" with marital sex in a way which may be insensitive to lesbians and other foremothers who chose unconventional lives.

Do these comments have anything to do with considerations of theory? Feminist theory cannot be pursued in a vacuum. Especially, we must be conscious of the ways in which race, class, and sexual identity affect our lot as women. It bears repeating: These factors are so strongly interactive with gender itself that no theoretical work which ignores their effects can be counted as adequate feminist theory, especially if a distinguishing mark of feminist theory is a certain normative vision. "Feminist credentials" cannot guarantee that the theory produced will be feminist theory. As Florynce Kennedy has said, "Liberation is like cleanliness--there's no way to liberate ourselves once and for all!" Self-liberation is a continual process of renewal, and the best guarantee that our theories will be infused with the values which make them genuine feminist theories.

QUESTIONS AND REFLECTIONS ON SCIENCE FOR WOMEN

Joan Cadden, Kenyon College

This essay raises a series of questions about science which illustrate the issues I think feminists should explore if we wish to improve women's position in science as it deals with women. This account is neither an exhaustive analysis nor original research; it is rather a personal essay. When I formulated questions and ideas for the "Science and Feminism" session at the GLCA Women's Studies Conference, I drew heavily upon the views of others, especially many students and faculty members with whom I have discussed these subjects. This version, particularly the section on teaching science, relies heavily upon the contributions of the participants in that session.

WHY A CRITIQUE OF SCIENCE?

We are, as students and teachers, committed to examining critically the questions we are asking, the methods we are using, the conclusions we are drawing, and effects we are creating. And we insist, as feminists, that all such examinations include consideration of the significance of our work for women. It follows that science, like everything else, demands careful scrutiny. But there are also more specific reasons for raising questions about science and the teaching of science. First, women participate less in the sciences than they do in the other major divisions of the liberal arts. This is the case whether we look at numbers of undergraduate majors, Ph.D.'s granted, or employment, though it is by no means the case that each scientific discipline engages a lower percentage of women than every non-scientific discipline. Second, and more important, science is powerful. If women are to assume their share of influence and responsibility in society, we must have access to power. In some ways, of course, science is no more or less powerful than other areas. Neither a biology professor studying pigmentation in toads nor a literature professor studying eighteenth-century metrics has the sense of running the show. Yet some science does have links with technology and thereby with the economy or national defense and thereby with politics, and these connections endow all science with status. Beyond the power derived from its practical connections (real and perceived), science and scientists enjoy the prestige and consequent influence associated in our society with the ideas of scientific method and objectivity

Science deserves our special attention for all these reasons, but a feminist critique of science is only a first step. If, as we have reason to suspect, the critique reveals inadequacies or injustices in the substantive and structural ways the sciences deal with women as subjects, as participants, or as audience, then we must make changes to correct them. In the short run, it is unlikely that the sorts of changes which can be made will have any important effect on the nature of the scientific enterprise; in the long run, it is quite possible that they will. Science students and science teachers with whom I have discussed the future of science have voiced various hopes and concerns about these long-term changes. Yet when science is taken in the large sense to include the persons who do it, the institutions in which it is done, and other concrete human elements, as well as a disembodied cluster of theories and methods, most agree that science (as well as other aspects of society) must change to make possible more and better science for women. This general goal is predicated on the assumptions, which no one in our group was inclined to question, that science is a worthy human enterprise and that women can do it, enjoy it, and profit from it.

The feminist perspective is not the only basis from which a critical examination of science should be undertaken. An understanding of the content, practices, and institutions from the point of view of class and race would likewise reveal issues which urgently need to be addressed. Indeed, although the experiences of various groups with traditionally limited access to science are not identical, people within these groups are confronted by some of the same impediments, such as teachers' low expectations of them. Thus, while this essay does not attempt to deal directly with the pressing problems of class and race, it may offer a general example and even some specific findings applicable to those issues.

Even with respect to feminist issues, this essay is incomplete. The questions I raise are intended as examples of the many directions a systematic critique might take. For various reasons, I have declined to consider a number of controversial points, some of which I wish simply to mention. Primarily because of their difficulty and complexity, I have not addressed the questions: Is there such a thing as a feminist scientific theory, e.g., a feminist mechanics? If so, what would it look like? Considered absurd by many, these questions are increasingly commanding the attention of serious scientists and philosophers. Because I regard it as irrelevant, I have ignored the debate about biological differences between men and women affecting science and math aptitude. We are so far from realizing the scientific potential of our population that we are in little danger of asking women to do more science than their nervous systems can bear.

WHAT WOULD A GENERAL CRITIQUE OF SCIENCE LOOK LIKE?

My purpose in raising a few critical questions about the scientific enterprise as a whole is to suggest that many aspects of the science we do and the way we do it have implications for women's roles in and attitudes toward the sciences. At the same time, simply raising these issues points up their enormity and complexity, and thus provides an excuse for my reluctance to draw conclusions, much less to propose a course of action. My values and hopes will, however, be apparent.

How is science defined and delineated?

In practical terms, science is perceived to be that which is done by approved people (Ph.D.'s, usually) in approved institutions (universities or industrial laboratories) and published in approved places (specialized journals). While such a characterization of the practice of science does not describe the ideal of science, it shows how science is experienced and lived. It is a closed system in which it is hard to get a job or a grant if you have not published, hard to do research if you do not have a job or a grant, and, of course, hard to publish if you have not done research. What does this mean for women? First, it means that scientific institutions are not open and democratic. Women (and other outsiders) must face and overcome the difficulties of breaking into a closed system. Second, it raises the issue of why and how some people, activities, and forms of publication are approved while others are not. Much field work, lab work, and technical writing done by non-Ph.D.'s (including many women) is sanctified only by passing through the hands of Ph.D.'s (usually men) whose names then appear as the authors of the published version. A noticeable, if not overwhelming, trend toward the inclusion of a broader range of scientific workers among coauthors is indicative of a willingness to reconsider what earns the label "science." The point is not, of course, that women who can and wish to be principal investigators should be satisfied with a technician's job as long as they get a by-line. It is both that those who contribute deserve acknowledgement and, more important, that what receives acknowledgement as science is socially and institutionally determined, and that choices of definitions or boundaries may have differential effects on men and women.

How is science organized?

This question is closely related to the previous one, and answers to it are likely to provide clues to crossing the borders into science. In one sense, science is organized hierarchically. An academic research project, for example, is typically headed by a Principal Investigator (with tenure and a big grant) who directs a staff of ranked associates—post doctoral fellows, graduate students, and perhaps a few lucky undergraduates. For feminists and others committed to collective control, such a hierarchy is in itself problematic. In addition to those scientific workers who are on the ladder (and intend to climb it), there are others—typically technicians and assistants of various sorts—who are not on the ladder and whose positions are, therefore, more or less static. Given the hierarchical aspects of science's organization, women interested in succeeding in science and those wishing to help them have been seeking ways to get more women started on the lower rungs. Some strategies have been developed, ranging from math workshops to internship programs, although actual efforts have been limited. This is an area in which undergraduate education, discussed below, can play a crucial role.

Another—and more radical—approach to the integration of women into science emerges if we look at the group of scientific workers who are not on the ladder. This group already contains a high proportion of women and offers a point of entry for talented people whose education and employment have not followed the prescribed patterns. Women entering the labor force after raising children or wishing to move on from long-held jobs which are neither monetarily nor intellectually rewarding could begin careers in science in support positions. The impact of this approach, however, will be limited if such positions continue to offer only limited opportunities for advancement. (Coauthorship, suggested above, is an acknowledgement of the contributions of support staff, not a solution to their problems.) The impact would be significantly increased if people in these positions were treated like apprentices, not assistants. The apprenticeship model of education in fact plays an important role in science as it is presently organized. If its benefits were systematically extended to a wider range of scientific workers, women entering science through apprenticeship positions could expect and be expected to make significant contributions.

What questions does science ask?

A feminist critique of science must ask about content as well as about context and structure. According to the mythology, applied science gets its questions from society, while basic research generates its own questions. Yet it is unlikely that so much interesting basic research in immunology would be going on were it not for public interest in cancer and organ transplants, or that there would be so much theoretical work on semi-conductors were it not for the electronics industry. These connections do not impugn the dignity of basic research or the character of the researcher. There is nothing sinister about a situation in which the substance of science is informed by economic, social, and political interests, but it does mean that we all must be aware of how these interests are formulated and communicated. The implications of these connections for women are most obvious in the biomedical sciences and in psychology, where gender is established as a subject matter or as a variable; in the mathematical and physical sciences they are not apparent. Once aware of the origins and effects of connections, we can and should discuss their relation to current economic, social, and political problems, including the status of women.

HOW DO WE TEACH SCIENCE?

Undergraduate education provides important opportunities for addressing, solving, or bypassing some of the problems identified above. But since many women come to college already seriously disadvantaged in the sciences, progress will depend upon our accepting responsibility for putting women on a better footing. To argue that, once a student is eighteen or twenty and has only sixty years to live, she has missed the chance, is to admit defeat and to belittle education.

What is the problem?

In general, we are seeking a situation in which women can have equal access to science. At a liberal arts college that may mean several things: making it easier for women committed to science to succeed; encouraging more women to commit themselves to science (by majoring in a science, for example); and inducing more women to make science an important aspect of their liberal arts program. These are separate problems, but by emphasizing the teaching of science at an introductory level we can raise questions relevant to all of them. In the following discussion, I am relying largely on the views of science students—mostly science majors—and to a lesser extent on the views of science teachers.

How does science present itself?

"Hard" is a word frequently invoked: As the opposite of "soft," it points to the objectivity and certainty alluded to above; as the opposite of "easy," it projects an image of inaccessibilty. Both senses have the double effect of alienating many people from science while conferring prestige upon those who undertake it. Even students who have chosen to take science courses speak frequently of feeling intimidated, or of a "sink-or-swim" atmosphere in which no encouragement or help seems available. (That the professor may be waiting, office door open, to explain the material as often and as fully as necessary does not seem to alter this perception.) Students point to this image as a major impediment to women's involvement in science, and suggest that science students (for whom it is a matter of pride), as well as science teachers, perpetuate the image. Indeed the same students who criticize the projection of this image of science take pains to insist that the changes they suggest would not "water down" science. Their suggestions are about course content (include more about background applications, current research issues); about course structure (in introductory science, require as low a student-teacher ratio as in introductory English); and about arrangements beyond the classroom (provide more student-student communication and help).

How do introductory courses work?

Students and teachers with whom I talked agreed that introductory courses, projecting the awesome image of science discussed above, often present students with a false view of what real science is like. Science is creative and open-ended, yet problem sets and examinations usually require doing things in a specified way and getting a specified result. Science is a cooperative effort, yet pressure and competition, as well as course design, often close off the possibility of collaboration. Students perceive this to be the case even in laboratories, where they claim often to feel isolated, ignorant, and without honorable recourse to assistance. Textbooks are the subject of particularly bitter criticism. They are not frightening, like exams; indeed they are in some ways rather comforting. But they present an authoritarian and static picture of scientific knowledge which epitomizes what students and teachers object to in introductory science courses: Science appears mechanical rather than human; answers and methods are given without the exploration of alternatives. The students with whom I talked were able to draw on positive experiences as bases for possible improvements: Make course labs more like research labs; give oral examinations in which students are asked to explore and discuss an issue rather than write tests which require students to solve a problem. What struck the group, all of whom were science enthusiasts, was that far from compromising science, the changes suggested would result in better science for everyone. Why, then, are we discussing them in the context of women's issues? While there may be some interesting philosophical issues involved, two practical responses should suffice: First, it does not seem harmful or dangerous to benefit other people, too. Second, while such measures are likely to benefit both men and women, they will probably have differential effects. For example, if equal numbers of men and women are attracted to a remedial math course, the course will produce a greater percentage increase in the number of women prepared to continue in math.

Why do we teach introductory science the way we do?

This question has a variety of historical, psychological, political, and pedagogical answers, but perhaps the most compelling is that it is efficient. Textbooks, problem sets, examinations, and the rest can quickly bring students closer to the front lines. The implicit goal is a narrow one, but the method does seem to work. I am not convinced, however, that efficiency is what we most need. If the efficient method advances some social groups and leaves others behind, I would prefer to sacrifice efficiency. If the efficient method is discouraging to those who would like to enjoy science without making it their primary pursuit, then I would prefer to sacrifice efficiency. If the efficient method conflicts with the true cooperative and open-ended character of science, then I would prefer to sacrifice efficiency. In the long run, I believe science will be more productive if it becomes more open, both intellectually and institutionally. But even if that is not the case, we should remember there are important values besides productivity. A science which contributes fully to social justice, science which has a place in everyone's education will be a very valuable science.

SUBJECT ACCESS TO WORKS ON WOMEN

Margaret L. Rogal, Oberlin College

A preliminary and fundamental step in gaining library skills in women's studies is to acquire a knowledge of subject-heading access to works on women. First, I will discuss how Library of Congress subject headings work or, more accurately, do not work for gaining access to works on women in our collections. I will then present alternative and supplemental ways to gain subject access to information on women. I will discuss bibliographies and periodical indexes and how they provide different and often better ways to approach the card catalog and to go beyond it to retrieve other forms of information.

I think exploring the structure of subject access to works on women is doubly important, for not only does it determine what material we will and will not find, but it shapes our image of ourselves. How women are classified in the card catalog reflects certain perceptions of and attitudes toward women and the categories thus created shape, in turn, our perception of ourselves.

The Card Catalog

The Library of Congress (LC) creates and assigns subject headings for the works in its collection. Most libraries in the United States adopt without question LC's headings and assignments for their own books. LC maintains a "controlled vocabulary" of subject terms for the card catalog—that is, it chooses certain headings and rejects others to provide access; so we users must learn, accept, and use those headings. As Joan Marshall has aptly described in her book, On Equal Terms: A Thesaurus for Nonsexist Indexing and Cataloging,[1] problems with LC subject headings for women fall into several categories, including nonspecificity, subsuming terminology, use of different wording and structure, and huge files of undifferentiated subjects under one heading.

Nonspecificity. Subject headings for women are often not specific. No subject heading, for example, provides specific access to works on pioneer women. To catch all possible books dealing with pioneer women, you must look under these three headings: WOMEN—THE WEST; PIONEERS—THE WEST; and FRONTIER AND PIONEER LIFE—THE WEST. Indeed, the book, Frontier Women: The Transmississippi West, 1940-1880, is found under the first and third of these headings. None of the subject headings combines the two aspects, pioneers and women.

Subsuming Terminology. This category includes headings that explicitly refer to men and subsume women, or general headings that subsume both general works and works on one sex or the other. An example of the former case is the heading PILGRIM FATHERS which was assigned to works on both men and women pilgrims. LC has recently changed this heading to PILGRIMS (NEW PLYMOUTH COLONY). An example of the latter case is LC's use of two headings for sports: SPORTS and SPORTS FOR WOMEN. The former includes books on men's sports and general books on sports for women. This is fine if I am looking for books on women's sports, but I may also want to look for general books on sports that include material on women. I must, therefore, search SPORTS as well. In searching the SPORTS category, however, I must differentiate between books on sports in general and books on sports for men, which is often impossible from the title alone. A book, The Psychology of Sport: The Behavior, Motivation, Personality and Performance of Athletes, for example, is cataloged under SPORTS-PSYCHOLOGICAL ASPECTS. I have no way of knowing if this book includes information on women athletes. A new heading, SPORTS FOR MEN, would enable all books on men's sports to be removed from the general file. I could then trust the heading SPORTS to include general books on sports for both men and women.

---

[1] I am indebted to J. Marshall for much of the material presented on LC subject headings.

Use of Different Wording and Structure of Headings for Women. Two headings used for librarians are LIBRARIANS and WOMEN LIBRARIANS. I must look in a different alphabetical place in the catalog to find information on librarians who are women. Rather, this heading should be LIBRARIANS, WOMEN. In fact, to avoid the problem of subsuming terminology, we might need LIBRARIANS, MEN as well. Male criminals are filed under CRIME AND CRIMINALS. Female criminals, however, are given a totally different descriptor: FEMALE OFFENDERS. The headings should be compatible: CRIME AND CRIMINALS, MEN; and CRIME AND CRIMINALS, WOMEN.

Huge Files of Undifferentiated Subjects Under One Heading. The Oberlin card catalog has ten inches of cards (about 1000 titles) under the heading WOMEN—EMPLOYMENT. Going through just two inches of this file, or about 200 titles, I found books dealing with fourteen distinct subjects. Either LC did not use the more specific headings in its vocabulary or, more often, it did not have a subject heading to cover the concept at hand.

Bibliographies

A growing number of bibliographies provide an alternatve avenue of access to works on women. Let's see how their subject headings compare to those in the card catalog.

Specificity. Bibliographies, by virtue of their more narrowly defined scope, tend to provide more specific subject access to works on women. One bibliography, Leonard's The American Woman in Colonial and Revolutionary Times, 1565-1800, devotes two chapters to pioneer women, thus providing easier and clearer subject access to books on this topic than the card catalog.

Subsuming Terminology. The value of a bibliography devoted to works on women is that it obviously lists information about women. Stineman's Women's Studies: A Recommended Core Bibliography has a chapter entitled "Sports" which includes the book, Psychology of Sports, mentioned above. The title is ambiguous, so that when I found it in the card catalog under SPORTS, I couldn't tell whether it was about men or about men and women in sports. Its appearance in Stineman, however, leaves no question. The annotation provides further information about the book's content, a bonus the card catalog can obviously not supply.

Structure of Subject Headings. In a bibliograhpy on women such as Stineman's, librarians who are women are simply LIBRARIANS and physicians who are women are simply PHYSICIANS. The problem presented by two different structures of wordings for headings about men and women does not exist.

Huge Files. Bibliographies tend not to present the problem of large files of undifferentiated titles because of their narrower scope and ability to instruct the user. Oakes' *Guide to Social Science Resources in Women's Studies*, for example, has a chapter "Working Wives and Mothers" in which is listed a book entitled *Dependence and Exploitation in Work and Marriage*. The LC headings assigned to this book are WOMEN—EMPLOYMENT; HOUSEWIVES; and SEX ROLES. None of these combines the concepts of work and marriage. The second comes closest, but HOUSEWIVES denotes women who do not work outside the home and, therefore, is not an accurate heading. Oakes, however, devotes a section to this combination of concepts—working wives and mothers—and further informs us about the book's content with an annotation.

Since bibliographies are usually selective, one cannot dispense with the card catalog, but the value of bibliographies as a mode of access to the card catalog is undeniable. They often provide an easier, quicker, and more accurate guide to specific titles which can then be checked against your library's holdings. Bibliographies may lead to interlibrary loan for works your library does not have. Finally, bibliographies often lead to articles in periodicals. Although not a substitute for the card catalog, they are valuable supplements.

Periodical Indexes

Some established periodical indexes are changing their subject structures to provide new or better access to information on women and, in one case, an altogether new index was created to serve exclusively the need of researchers to identify articles from the broad spectrum of periodicals devoted to or including articles on women. I want to look at the subject heading access of *Sociological Abstracts (SA)*, an example of the former case, and *Women's Studies Abstracts (WSA)*, the latter case.

SA has added a category—"Feminist Studies"—to its table of contents, so a user can easily read through all the studies related to women. A detailed index provides additional subject access. One article, "The Employment of Wives in Middle Class Black Families," is indexed under three headings—EMPLOYMENT, WIVES, and BLACKS. And under each heading the articles are alphabetized by another significant word in the title, for example, EMPLOYMENT—WIVES. The subject access is specific and provides the capability to combine concepts.

WSA answers a real need in bringing together in one place articles on women from a broad range of disciplines. Unfortunately, I found the subject access inconsistent. This is the configuration for the indexing of black women in three succeeding issues:

Spring 1978

- Black
  - children
  - family
  - history
  - movement
  - students
  - women (7 citations)
- Blacks

Summer-Fall 1978

- Black children
- Black college students
- Black families

- Black women
  - cervical cancer of
  - divorce of
  - equality of
  - marital disruption and
- Blacks

Winter 1978/79

- Black women (9 citations)
- Blacks

The headings differ in structure and specificity from one to the other. In Summer-Fall, for example, the four articles on black women are divided into four subheadings, while in the other two (Spring, with seven numbers listed after black women; and Winter, with nine), no such subdivision is provided. In addition, the heading BLACKS in each issue offers no clue as to the articles' contents.

Subject-heading access to works on women is perplexing. The card catalog offers the virtue of a controlled vocabulary, so at least the user can determine all the possible subject headings under which to look, but she simultaneously confronts the problem of nonspecific, subsuming, inconsistently structured, and general headings, that make finding the appropriate book difficult and may affect her self-esteem in the process. Bibliographies offer an alternative to the card catalog, through more specific, easier, and clearer subject access. The choice and structure of subject headings, however, differ from one bibliography to the next, and the user loses the reliability of a controlled vocabulary. Indexes often provide sole access to a body of periodical literature and although they may offer specific, multi-faceted subject approaches, they can be even more difficult to use than bibliographies. In addition to the lack of uniformity from one index to the next, a single index may offer inconsistent subject heading structures from one issue to the next.

Finally, we must acknowledge, accept, and use the subject heading structure that exists. As feminist librarians, we can work to change the structure. As feminist users, we can gain some power and control over the bibliographical system by making ourselves aware of the liabilities of how the subject heading structure works.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR WOMEN'S STUDIES RESEARCH: AN INTRODUCTION

Eileen McGrath, Wabash College

There are similarities between the attention given to women's studies topics and the use of government publications by students and scholars. Women's studies is a large, multifaceted field that is relatively untapped and that was neglected in the academy until quite recently. Part of the reason for this neglect was that periodical indexes, literature surveys, and other guides for academic research did not adequately cover women, the conditions of their existence, and their contributions Major literature surveys and guides for research on women's studies topics did not appear until the late 1960s, and it was not until almost a decade later that the standard periodical indexes began to cover Signs, Women and Literature, and other women's studies journals.

Government publications have also been neglected, despite the fact that they constitute an extremely large and valuable source of information. The United States federal government is the largest publisher in the world (The Government Printing Office published over 50,000 titles in 1979), yet its publications are just part of what librarians mean when they speak of "government publications." State, local, and international governmental bodies all make contributions to the field of government publications. The form of these publications can range from a poster to a multi-volume set, and the content can range from subatomic physics to breastfeeding. The use of government publications prior to 1970 was limited because these publications were given scant attention in standard indexes, and the specialized indexes for government publications were unsophisticated and unreliable. The situation has improved as competent private publishers began major indexes to government publications and governments improved their own indexes and increased the availability of their publications by producing larger press runs and distributing more publications to libraries and the public.

Because of the bibliographic reforms of the 1970s, I can talk about government publications with some confidence that you will be able to locate the titles discussed. My goal is to demonstrate that government publications constitute a large and varied source of information for women's studies researchers, a source that should no longer be neglected.

I have chosen to introduce the world of government publishing by discussing the types of information that are contained in government publications. The first major type of information that is available from governments is statistical data. Virtually all governments collect data on the resources and people within their jurisdiction. They collect data because they have a legal mandate to do so (this is the case with the census), because government officials have an interest in a topic, or because data is produced as a by-product of a regulatory or accounting function. The United States government collects and publishes so many statistics that a private publisher has created a continuing index devoted to federal statistical publications. (This index is the American Statistics Index, published by Congressional Information Service, Inc.) All this data collection is significant to women's studies researchers because some of it can help illuminate topics of concern to us. In government publications we can find such information as:

the sex and race of murder victims in the United States
the average salaries of men and women employed by the federal government
the number of full-time female faculty members in American colleges and universities

The availability of data like this allows us to study topics such as violence towards women, the economic disadvantages of being a woman, and the combined effects of sexual and racial discrimination. In considering a topic for which statistical data might be helpful, you should assume that unless the data might reveal a personal or corporate identity or violate privacy, it is available in a government publication.

The data that is available for us to use is also available to those within government. Government officials know that statistics can illuminate a topic, but they also realize that statistics often need interpretation and that not all issues can be quantified. Because of these realizations, government officials commission research studies. These research studies are the second major type of information resource that I want to bring to your attention. Governments employ experts and procure the temporary services of outside authorities in order to examine topics of concern. These studies vary as much as the subjects about which governments collect statistics, and some of them are of interest to feminist scholars. These two studies exhibit the type of information available:

Window Dressing on the Set
(A study by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights on the portrayal of women and minorities on television and their use as anchorpersons and correspondents.)

More Hurdles to Clear
(A study by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights on the participation of women and girls in competitive athletics.)

Often governments are not content just to commission and publish research studies. When there is popular interest or strong organized pressure to explore a topic, governments will hold conferences that bring together government officials, experts, and concerned citizens. Three very important topics of the 1970s were cancer, energy, and women's rights. Many governments held conferences on one or more of these subjects, and then published their proceedings and recommendations. The published conference proceedings can be valuable information sources to us because they contain a range of opinions not usually found in research studies or commercially produced monographs. Two representative published proceedings are:

Battered Women: Issues of Public Policy.
(The proceedings of a consultation sponsored by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.)

Discrimination Against Minorities and Women in Pensions and Health, Life, and Disability Insurance. (The proceedings of another U.S. Commission on Civil Rights Consultation.)

Like conferences, bibliographies are produced by governments in response to a perceived interest either from the public or from within the bureaucracy. Some of these bibliographies cover only government publications, but some also list commercial publications. The research studies and conference proceedings that I've mentioned often contain bibliographies. Also, major bibliographies frequently are published as separate titles. General access tools such as those listed at the end of this paper are actually bibliographies, but they can be used to find specialized bibliographies such as:

> Selected Readings on Mother-Infant Bonding.
> (A literature survey and bibliography produced by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.)
>
> Printout of Literature Search on Rape.
>
> (Produced by the National Institute of Mental Health.)

Finally, we come to what most people think of when they hear the term "government publications": reports by governments on their activities. Court decisions, Congressional hearings, compilations of legislation, and annual reports of agencies and departments are all reports on government activities. These are sources that researchers are most reluctant to use, yet for certain topics these sources must be used. If you are researching the legal status of women in Indiana you must use the Indiana Code; if you are researching the career advancement of women within the federal government you'll need to examine the names in the United States Government Manual, the Congressional Staff Directory, and other government employment lists, and to supplement these sources with information contained in Congressional hearings on the employment of women and minorities by the federal government.

On the side of the researcher who is attempting to use this last category of information source is the fact that many of the improvements in bibliographic access, as well as the government's own bibliographic reforms in the 1970s, have been directed toward this type of publication. Now, regardless of the type of information you desire, there are two approaches to use to find information. One approach is to identify government agencies doing work in your area and to keep abreast of what they publish. If you take this approach you should start with the United States Government Manual or the appropriate state or international guide. By browsing or using the subject index in these guides you can identify the agencies interested in your topic. This list should be compared against the agencies listed as authors or publishers in standard bibliographies on your topic. Next you can go to the Monthly Catalog of United States Government Publications or another comprehensive index of government publications and look up the publications of the agencies that you've identified; or, you can go directly to the government documents section of your library and look at the items on the shelves. (Federal depository documents collections are usually arranged by a classification scheme that is based on such things as departments and agencies.) Doing the last step periodically will keep your research uptodate.

The approach outlined above is not the one normally recommended by librarians. The more standard approach to using government publications in research is to go directly to the appropriate indexes to identify specific publications on your topic. (A list of the major indexes is appended to this paper.) Using this approach you are less likely to miss a publication that has an unlikely source, and your research will not be thwarted by the bureaucratic reshuffliing that can move agencies and responsibilities without warning.

Either approach is valid; both will be most fruitful if you have access to a library with a large government documents collection, and if you become acquainted with the librarian who is in charge of that collection. Few libraries that are part of the federal depository library system select all the publications that the government offers. Find out what selections your library takes and what ones are refused. Talk with your documents librarian and make her or him aware of your research interest. Most documents librarians have a missionary zeal toward government publications; your interest will be warmly received. Finally, start talking to others who have an interest in your subject. You may find that they are aware of government publications that you can use. If they are ignorant of government publications, seize the opportunity to tell them about all the types of information contained in government publications. Do your part to eliminate the academy's neglect of these valuable sources of information.

MAJOR INDEXES TO GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

American Statistics Index. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Information Service, 1973-
(Library of Congress call number: Z 7554 .U5 A46)
An index to federal government publications containing statistical information.

Congressional Information Service. C I S Annual (and Supplements). Washington, D.C.: Congressional Information Service, 1970-
(Library of Congress call number: KF 49 .C62)
An index to the publications of Congress.

Congressional Information Service . C I S U.S. Serial Set Index. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Information Service, 1975-
(Library of Congress call number: Z 1223 .Z9 C65 1975)
An index to the publications of Congress.

Public Affairs Information Service. Bulletin. New York: Public Affairs Information Service, 1975-
(Library of Congress call number: Z 7163 .P9)
An index covering materials on public affairs from both commercial and government publishers.

United States. Superintendent of Documents. Monthly Catalog of United States Government Publications. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1895-
(Government Documents call number: GP 3.8/3)
An index to Congressional, executive department, and federal independent agency publications.

United States. Library of Congress. Exchange and Gift Division. Monthly Checklist of State Publications. Washington, D. C.: Library of Congress, 1910-
(Government Documents call number: LC 30.9)
An index to state publications received at the Library of Congress.

UNDOC: Current Index: United Nations Document Index. New York: United Nations, 1979-
(Library of Congress call number: JX 1977 .A2)
An index to the publications of the United Nations and its major affiliated agencies. Published under various titles with differing formats 1950-1978.

REFERENCES

United States, Commission on Civil Rights. Window dressing on the set: women and minorities in television. Washington, D.C.: Commission on Civil Rights, 1977. (Government Documents call number: CR 1.2:T23)
(An analysis of the portrayal of women and minorities on television and their use as correspondents and anchorpersons.)

United States. Commission on Civil Rights. More hurdles to clear: women and girls in competitive athletics. Washington, D.C.: Commission on Civil Rights, 1980. (CR 1.10:63).

United States. Commission on Civil Rights. Battered women: issues of public policy. Washington, D.C.: Commission on Civil Rights, 1978. (CR 1.2:W84/3).

Discrimination against minorities and women in pension, health, life and disability insurance. Washington, D.C.: Commission on Civil Rights, 1978. (CR 1.2:M66/v.1-2)

Yost, Kathleen M., compiler. Selected readings on mother-infant bonding. Washington, D.C.: National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect, 1979 (HE 23.1210:M85).

National Center for the Prevention and Control of Rape. Printout of literature search on rape (and) sexual assault. Rockville, MD.: National Center for the Prevention and Control of Rape, 1979 (HE 20.8113:R18/2).

ARCHIVES AND WOMEN'S HISTORY RESEARCH

Marlene Merrill, Oberlin College

As a user of archives, I am primarily interested in researching the lives of heretofore invisible women. My comments are drawn from my work in college and university archives, regional historical societies, and larger research centers. No one system of cataloging or identifying archival holdings operates throughout these various repositories—even within groups of repositories handling similar material, such as college-associated archives. There is no uniform tool, such as a card catalog, organized around some standard system like the Dewey Decimal or Library of Congress system. Rather, individual archives have their own system of organizing and presenting materials and holdings to researchers. Therefore, it is important to take time to learn something about the organizing principles in individual archives. It means asking for guides to the holdings and it also means asking the archivist or curator how women are cataloged, indexed, or presented in reference aids. For example, an obvious question to ask is whether women's maiden names or married names are used in a particular collection or index.

Most archives, like most libraries, describe their materials in the traditional categories of male-oriented history. There are few entry listings for women, who are generally subsumed under the male category. Since married women carry their husbands' names, for instance, they tend to disappear in family correspondences which are almost always organized by the names of male family members. Especially in the nineteenth century, important papers of wives, daughters, and sisters (such as personal correspondence, diaries, and lecture notes) are contained within the collection named for a husband, father, or brother. Many archives have "calendars" or indexes for large collections of correspondence. These itemized the names of correspondents by the date of the latter, and often this includes even a dateline. Such indexes make it possible to identify letters written by women and save countless hours of sifting through files of letters looking for signatures. "Box lists" are also important guides to collections; they can indicate the presence of items such as personal journals, ledgers, or diaries. Sometimes, however, such items are bound and turn up on library shelves as part of special collections. In that case, they can be located, if the author is known, through the library's card catalog. For example, if a researcher wishes to examine a library's collection of nineteenth-century women's personal journals, but does not know the authors' names, she could ask for the shelf list for personal journals or diaries. This will provide more information on individual journals and will locate them for later examination.

Because researchers in women's history have to spend a great deal of time searching for material, they must develop resourcefulness in tracking down leads to such material. They need to know how to enlist the help and good will of archivists and curators who often can provide "leads" based on their first-hand knowledge of holdings. They need patience, as well as a large supply of good luck.

As women's history moves from its marginal position into the historical mainstream, new conceptual models, as well as new retrieval tools, must be developed to preserve and organize women's individual and collective histories. Expanded and more detailed guides to women's primary source material are beginning to appear. For example, the 1980 publication of Women's History Sources (R. R. Bowker Company), which describes over 18,000 collections of primary source material from 1,586 repositories, is a major contribution to the field. Subject headings, as well as names, need to be included in general guides so that we can retrieve information about "emigrant women," "women teachers," "women missionaries," and others. Collection titles need to be more inclusive: "The John Doe Papers" should read "The Mary and John Doe Papers," if Mary's correspondence, diaries, or other papers relating to her life are part of the collection.

We have just begun to recover women's history. Most of the sources still lie buried under male names and categories which do not even suggest their existence. Our task is two-fold: Archival systems and reference aids to collections must continue to be improved, and researchers must commmit the time and develop the resourcefulness required to transform history by making the lives of women visible.

THREE DECADES OF REMINISCENCES ABOUT WOMEN IN THE ACADEMY

Thalia Gouma-Peterson, The College of Wooster

I came to the United States in 1952 from Pierce College, a women's high school in Athens, Greece. During my years there as a student, I had always taken the friendship and companionship of women for granted. I had excellent teachers in history, psychology, chemistry, art, ancient Greek, physical education, and philosophy, all of them women; and I had come to take for granted the existence of strong and inspiring women role models. Many of these women were single. I did not realize then that this would prove to be common among professional women. I still remember them distinctly, for their warmth, their intelligence, their dedication, and their encouragement. The president of the school also was a woman, an American in her sixties, rather eccentric and colorful. Many of the Greek students made fun of her, but I found her rather splendid.

I won the Fulbright award and arrived at Mills College in September, 1952, assuming, erroneously, that I would find the same spirit of companionship and friendship. Very quickly, however, I learned that, although Mills, like Pierce, was a small women's institution, most of my teachers were men. Of the few women, most were single. They were considered brilliant, eccentric, and difficult. My major professor, a German emigre, was an excellent and stimulating teacher. With our common European background as a bond, he encouraged and supported me and, in fact, became my role model.

There was one woman art historian, a visiting assistant professor. She was married, taught part-time, and commuted from out of town. Because the student grapevine rumored her to be disorganized and effusive, I resisted taking a course from her until graduation requirements finally forced me to do so. She was disorganized, to be sure, but she loved her subject passionately and communicated that love to all of us. She was also extremely warm and kind. While I became very fond of her, I did not regard her as my model or inspiration. She was not, I thought, "up to the level" of my male professors. Only years later, when as a college teacher I began to review my own undergraduate experience, did this warm and passionate teacher re-emerge in my mind as one of the positive elements from my past. Later yet I discovered that among specialists in the field she has an outstanding reputation as a connoisseur of Chinese art. Mills students did not know that.

At Mills I first became aware of another category of women, the "faculty wife." Many of these women had academic or professional credentials, but few of them had jobs or any "official" status. Students saw them as "difficult and troublesome" or even as "devious." They were to be avoided. The one exception was a French woman, the wife of a distinguished composer, who taught at Mills every other year. She taught French courses (as a lecturer, of course), presided over the French Club, and directed French plays. The students were awed by this charming and exotic, independent woman. I got to know her when I was a member of the French Club, then became her assistant in a children's class, and played major roles in every production she directed. Although she meant much to me, I did not then realize how important her presence at Mills was for me and how much her friendship eased my moments of loneliness and doubt. She told me something which I did not fully understand at the time, but which I never forgot: "When a woman gets married, she should make sure the sacrifice is worth it."

In 1956 I went to the University of Wisconsin to begin work toward my Ph.D. All my professors—both in my major field, art history, and in my minor, theater—were men. By now I was not surprised by that. I was surprised, however, to discover that almost all the graduate assistants in the department were women. As a small group of pre-professional women trying to succeed in a male world, we did not form many friendships. The competition was intense. Most of my friends were male graduate students. Undergraduate women, to whom I was closest in age, could not become my friends, for I was now their teacher and, I discovered, their role model.

Once again I encountered the "faculty wife." Again women in that category were considered either "difficult and problematic" or "kind and motherly." This time the exception was the wife of my major professor, a woman of great intelligence, humor, and humanity. She was a professional musician and teacher, European born and trained, who had married my professor after he became a widower. She was strong and sensitive, direct and witty; she sustained a full teaching schedule and managed the home. The meetings of the graduate seminar at their house were among the most pleasant weekly events. After the formal session, we discussed music and art over cups of tea and her splendid cakes. She and I developed a close friendship that continued after her husband's unexpected death and, several years later, I stayed with her when I returned to Wisconsin to take my Ph.D. orals. She told me then that she had always been confident that I was going to complete the degree. I had not been so confident.

In my second year of graduate school, I married a fellow graduate student and entered the "couples world." I still was seen as the capable, unusual Greek teaching assistant, but I also had become someone's wife. At the time, the two roles did not seem to be in conflict. I became aware of the struggle of the wives to hold their own, but did not have much time to develop friendships with them since it was my first year of full-time teaching. During that year my husband accepted a teaching position at Oberlin College. I stayed in Wisconsin and we became one of the early commutng couples, seeing each other on weekends—a ten-hour drive in those days. When the year ended, I joined my husband at Oberlin and became—overnight—a "faculty wife."

I remembered that year as one of extreme disorientation. I had no job, I was pregnant, and I was viewed not as myself, but as someone's wife. I remember vividly that, at the first meeting of the faculty wives, we were asked to introduce ourselves and state "our department." One by one, each wife introduced herself as belonging to her husband's department. When my turn came I stated that my husband taught English, but I did not belong to the English department; I was an art historian completing my Ph.D. at the University of Wisconsin. The group was startled. As I became acquainted with more wives, I realized that many were struggling for existence. It was not easy. We talked about children, natural childbirth, and baking bread. I felt that my mind was atrophying day by day.

One bright thread during that year, besides the birth of our first son, was a growing friendship with several members of the art department, one of them the only woman art historian on the faculty. They took me seriously as an art historian, and the following year, they asked me to teach a section of the introductory course. Even though Oberlin's anti-nepotism rule meant that I could teach only as a lecturer on a temporary appointment, I accepted gladly. Thus began eight years of part-time teaching, as a faculty wife who was allowed only on the fringes of the academy. I soon discovered that there was a whole group of us, all faculty wives with doctoral degrees. We did not have offices and could not attend faculty meetings, but we were more fortunate than many faculty wives with Ph.D.s who were not even allowed to teach part-time.

During those years, 1959-1967, there were few women faculty on continuing appointments at Oberlin. Most of them were in their late fifties and sixties and were teaching in the humanities. Many were single and most were considered difficult. One of these was my senior colleague in the art department, a distinguished teacher and scholar. She befriended and supported me through my eight years of frustration and instability and remains a friend and role model. Another faculty wife in the department, a Ph.D. from a distinguished eastern university, taught for years at a prestigious New England college. This required that she and her husband, a professor at Oberlin, live apart for one semester each year. Eventually, she tired of moving back and forth and settled in Oberlin as a perpetual lecturer. I admired and respected her and we developed a lasting friendship. Some of the younger women on the museum staff also became friends and I found myself in a small circle of professional women friends. Except for one year when I was asked to teach full-time as an instructor, however, the teaching was sporadic, undependable, and poorly paid.

Since I had been a full member of the faculty at Wisconsin for one year before coming to Oberlin, I found the demotion to part-time lecturer very difficult to take. My discontent increased after I completed my Ph.D. in 1964. Then, in 1967, the final blow occurred when the man whom I had replaced during his leave retired, and I could not even be considered as a candidate for his position (my special field). A series of bright-eyed young men were brought in as candidates, and I was among those interviewing them. I had had enough. Then and there I decided to look for a position within commuting distance.

In 1968, at the age of thirty-six, I began my new career as a visiting assistant professor at The College of Wooster. My older woman colleague and friend in the Oberlin art department nearly wept when I announced my decision to leave. I too was unhappy, but I knew that I must now focus on my new professional life. The decision was reinforced when a friend, who taught English composition at Oberlin as a lecturer for fourteen years, called to thank me for not putting up with the situation any longer, for showing that married women can live with professional dignity. She left Oberlin for a position at Cleveland State the next year and is now a full professor.

At Wooster I was an oddity: a married woman in a half-time position, commuting from out of town. I remembered my woman professor from Mills. But I finally had a regular and continuing appointment and was a full-fledged member of the faculty. When I looked around at my first faculty meeting, I was struck by the small number of women. Of those few, most were in their sixties and were single, and I learned soon enough that many were considered difficult by younger male colleagues. For the next five years there were no more than five women under fifty on the Wooster faculty and none of them had tenure. My closest friends were male colleagues of my own age. I served with them on committees as the token woman. As an "accepted" member of the predominantly male faculty, I remained isolated from my senior women colleagues.

As we moved into the seventies, more young women were hired, many of them in temporary positions. By 1975 the number of younger women in continuing positions had increased. We established a Committee on the Status of Women and also began meeting at "Women's Table." Many of the older women who had been on the faculty when I arrived had retired. There still were very few women around, but we were closer in age and began to develop a relationship of trust and support. We fought the good fight together and often lost.

As at Oberlin, Wisconsin, and Mills, the nebulous category of "faculty wife" continues to exist at Wooster. Even though the anti-nepotism rule was abolished by the College seven years ago, the problems for faculty wives have not been resolved. The majority exist on the fringes of the academic community and remain "non-persons." The Committee on the Status of Women, which has been sympathetic to their plight and has invited them to open meetings, has been unable to help them in specific ways.

Some faculty wives with professional degrees have decided to retrain at nearby graduate schools in order to move into non-academic professions. Others are employed in part-time or full-time admininstrative positions. Only a few have achieved faculty positions in their special fields; and while the option to be considered now exists, that does not guarantee fair and equal consideration, especially if the faculty wife is "older" (i.e., over thirty-five).

By far the largest number of faculty wives are employed by the College in administrative positions or in the library. I was amazed to find out that these appointments are resented by some of the women on the faculty and staff, who are unable to see the faculty wife as a professional woman and who consider these appointments as expressions of favoritism. We still have a long way to go.

In 1977 I received tenure and was promoted to full professor. In 1979, after a year's research leave, I returned to find that several of my younger women colleagues had left and quite a few new ones had been hired. To my surprise, one of the younger women mistook me for a colleague ten years older than I, a respected senior woman whom I had looked up to and admired. Clearly, within two years I had shifted ranks and had become one of the few "older, established" women faculty. I wondered whether I was now considered "difficult." When I recently addressed this question to one of my younger female friends on the faculty, she laughed and answered, "Thalia, you have always been difficult. That is why we love you." Perhaps there is hope after all. Perhaps we will increasingly move out of our isolation and will be able to support each other as full human beings.

HISTORY OF A WEEKEND

Eva Hooker, C.S.C., Saint Mary's College

Presentation from the Closing Panel, "'The Women's Studies Connection' Where Are We in the wider Context?" Panelists: Eva Hooker, C.S.C., Associate Dean of the Faculty, Saint Mary's College; Doris Friedensohn, Women's Studies, Jersey City State College; Elaine Reuben, Coordinator, National Women's Studies Association. Moderator: Jon Fuller, GLCA President.

In August, I received a phone call inviting me to join a group that was planning GLCA's first National Summer Institute in Women's Studies. The group described itself as taking on the transformation of the academy. Not just a piece, not just women's studies, but the whole working and studying place of the profession. I was stunned at the boldness of the group--and something else--the courage and the gentleness as well. So I came here with curiosity. What was the source of all this energy? What were the working and thinking like from which such an adventurous enterprise could come? What were the ideas and feelings which sustained this effort?

When we arrived at this Conference, what greeted us as we entered the front hall were the syllabi--the emblems and icons of the achievement already won. Two things were obvious: The academic respectability of the enterprise was taken for granted and the breaking of the disciplines was an assumption. The syllabi as greeters were a wonderful political tactic--a very quiet kind of statement. You just hang them up and let people look. The mind of the teacher changes even as she looks at courses already transformed.

From the front hall I moved on to the opening panel on women's work experience. A story form. Besides the immense joy of being together to share work stories, there was, over the weekend, a lot of other kinds of storytelling. Certain themes, whatever the story, dominated the sessions: isolation, anger, loneliness, fatigue, fragmentation.

Two other themes, both of them forms of opposition, appeared repeatedly. The "we" versus "they": the masculine and the feminine. And another "we" versus "they": woman versus woman. We have met the enemy and it is us; women divided by age, sexual preference, tenure or lack of it. I don't want to overplay these oppositions, but they occurred often enough in imagery and conversation to be striking.

Note: Because much of the panel was primarily concerned with issues related specifically to the GLCA Women's Studies Program, we chose to publish just one of the presentations.

The evening session on friendship was a startling addition to a professional meeting for me. I have never been to a conference at which the discussion of friendship was part of what was to be "done" there. A clear image of women's lives as a whole piece emerged--thinking, teaching, loving, befriending, working, waiting--even shopping. It was a lovely and rich image, but somewhat diminished for me by our inability to say more clearly what we meant by friendship. We need to define and refine with much greater care and delicacy the relationships between women who work together. These seems to be an assumption that women who work together will befriend each other. Is that the case? I heard women talk about having been the pathfinders (untrained pathfinders at that) only to turn around and see trained younger women breathing down their necks. Is there joy in that discovery or consternation?

Some questions:

1. Does transformation of the academy include a total transformation of our metaphors for the teacher/student relationship? Is "sister" an adequate substitute for whatever it is we are talking about when we say the teacher was mother? What has happened to mentor, guide; to apprenticeship, discipleship? Are there new words we want to add to that list?

2. A more personal note. Women in some women's colleges (not all) are not isolated. We have assumed real political power in our institutions and in some cases have reclaimed that power after a long hiatus. Our problem is that we often do not know how to use that power as a group. We have found that friendship is NOT enough. You, on the other hand, perhaps because you are isolated, have learned to use political power in clever ways. Will you share the political know-how with us?

3. The September issue of Scientific American described one future world for us. Even as we sit here this morning, the desert is moving by inches over the land in Africa. People are starving all over the world and will continue to do so in greater numbers. Thousands of men and women and children cannot and will not EAT. Does transformation of the academy have anything to do with facing the mind-numbing political, economic, and scientific problems which hug our universe and destroy the bodies of millions of people?

It is a commonplace that the liberal arts are supposed to liberate the spirit. Elizabeth Kennan, president of Mount Holyoke College, has asked her faculty to reclaim the life of the spirit and the exercise of the spirit as an antidote to the hopelessness and despair which one feels in the face of the ever-moving Sahara. Only if the soul is alive, can we even begin to imagine how to survive in the world of one future.

SIXTH ANNUAL GLCA WOMEN'S STUDIES CONFERENCE

TOWARD A FEMINIST TRANSFORMATION OF THE ACADEMY: II

November 7-9, 1980

Geneva Conference Center
Rochester, Indiana

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 7

1:30 p.m. Concurrent Sessions:

"Right Out of History"—A new film about the creation and construction of "The Dinner Party" exhibit. The film showing will be followed by discussion of controversies regarding "The Dinner Party" and this film.—Discussion leader: John Schilb, English, Denison.

"Alive"—This videotape includes cuts from the October 10, 1979, Columbus concert of this five-member women's jazz ensemble and brief clips from an interview in which the musicians discuss being an all-women group and analyze why their music is so powerful to them and to their audiences, female and male. The musicians are from Berkeley, California, and play in jazz clubs as well as for women's audiences.

3:00 p.m. Opening Panel:

"From Our Work and Experience: Questions for the Academy." Panelists: Louise Bernikow, author of several books (including Among Women, Harmony, 1980), New York City; Deborah Hilty, Executive Assistant to the President, Wooster; and Doris Friedensohn, Women's Studies and American Studies, Jersey City State College. Moderator: Brenda Bankart, Psychology, Wabash.

6:30 p.m. Concurrent Sessions:

Student Meeting—An opportunity to share information and common concerns.

Librarians: An Informal Session—Share ways you have provided service in women's studies or problems you'd like addressed. Bibliographic instruction, access to periodicals, pamphlet file....—Convener: Margaret Rogal, Librarian, Oberlin.

Breaking the Disciplines—Divisional meetings to look at syllabi, course materials, and raise curricular questions. Sessions will be set up by division rather than discipline to encourage interdisciplinary discussion and thinking. Participants may choose to attend the divisional session in which their field seems best to fit or in which they wish to gain more information

Sciences—Convener: Bonnie Lamvermeyer, Biology, Denison.
Humanities—Convener: Erika Laquer, History, Wooster.
Fine Arts—Convener: Marcia Wood, Fine Arts, Kalamazoo.

7:30 p.m. Concurrent Sessions:

From the "Womanhouse" to the "Dinner Party" and the "Heart of the House": Feminist Art of the Seventies—a slide presentation and lecture.—Thalia Gouma-Peterson, Art History, Wooster.

Cracking the Card Catalog, Or How a Feminist Finds Her Way Around the Library—Four panelists will explain how to find information on women in the library. They will discuss problems of library research in women's studies and how to help yourself and your library respond to the problems. Topics to be covered include basic library research strategy in women's studies, government publications on women, on-line data base services, and archival research.—Margaret Rogal, Reference Librarian, Oberlin; Eileen McGrath, Technical Services Librarian, Wabash; Linda Parker, Women's Studies Librarian-at-Large, University of Wisconsin; and Marly Merrill, Historian working in Oberlin's archives.

Female Friendship: Virginia Woolf and Katherine Mansfield. A Case Study, Mirror For Our Own Lives—Manipulation and interference by men. Competition. Inability to "see" one another. The difficulty of nurturing. Sexual tension. "You hurt me" becomes "I hate you." The Woolf-Mansfield relationship, which ended with Woolf saying that without Mansfield alive there was no one to write for, raises crucial and difficult issues in female friendships, which the workshop will explore.—Louise Bernikow, Author, New York City.

Women's Studies: Are We As Truly Interdisciplinary As We Claim?—We will explore the claim, made by so many of us, that women's studies is necessarily interdisciplinary. What have been the limits of this claim (in actual practice) and how have we been bound by a narrow traditional definition of "interdisciplinary"? In what ways must we and can we go beyond this definition to include material about women from diverse life situations, cultures, and races?—Ann Fitzgerald, Women's Studies, Denison; and Barbara Smith, Women's Studies, Unviersity of Massachusetts-Boston.

Women and the Law—This workshop looks at how the legal system views women and explores the state of the law in various areas affecting women's lives, such as domestic violence, rape, abortion, divorce/dissolution, child custody, wills, trusts, and the ERA.—Marj Rowland, third-year student, University of Dayton Law School

Science and Feminism: Questions About the Learning, Teaching, and Doing of Science on College Campuses—A workshop and discussion of issues arising from our experiences as students, teachers, researchers, and/or avoiders of science and math. Are science courses intimidating to women who might otherwise make contributions to women's studies? Are the context and content of science courses gender-fair?—Juliana Mulroy, Biology, Denison; Joan Cadden, History of Science, Kenyon; and Mary Schilling, Mellon Program on New Career Opportunities for Women, Denison.

9:15 p.m. Concurrent Sessions:

Women's Music, Women's Studies, and the Quality of Campus Life—Workshop on the potential roles of women's music in women's studies classrooms and in campus life. Music as autobiography, as literature, as the reflection of women's experiences across class, race, and history.—Juliana Mulroy, Biology, Denison; Becky Pschirrer, Disc Jockey and Student, Denison; Judy Mornan, Student, Denison; Ann Fitzgerald, Women's Studies, Denison.

Transformation of Relationships in a Transformed Academy (for men)—This session will provide an opportunity for men to explore the ways that feminist ideals have changed and influenced their personal and professional relations on the campus Several participants have expressed interest in discussing the particular challenges and paradoxes involved in relationships with feminist women.—Len Berkey, Albion; John Schilb, Denison; Lauren Wilson, Ohio Wesleyan; and David Solomon, Oberlin student, with Peter Bankart, Wabash, as moderator.

The Creative Writing Class As a Feminist Experience—This workshop will provide a feminist model for class design and demonstrate the kinds of writing exercises which are particularly applicable to the development of what might be called the "feminist aesthetic." What are the politics of the traditional creative writing class and how do these interfere with the creative process? What are concrete ways of embodying feminist values in a creative writing class? Since students are very often threatened by the kinds of exercises and tasks they are asked to perform in such a class, how does one deal with this problem?—Ruth Danon, English, Denison.

10:15 p.m. Feminist Voices—Share your own poetry, prose, or songs with us.—Jami Peelle, Librarian, Kenyon.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 8

9:00 a.m. Community Meeting

11:00 a.m. Keynote:

Elaine Reuben, Coordinator, National Women's Studies Association, will address the theme of the Conference, "Toward a Feminist Transformation of the Academy."

1:30 p.m. Concurrent Sessions:

Toward a Feminist Perspective on Research Methodology—"Current Questions in Literary Criticism," Peg Lourie, English, University of Michigan; "Feminist Methodology: The Illusive Concept," Judith Cook, Sociology, Ohio State University; "Feminist Research Strategies," Mary Margaret Fonow, Otterbein College; and "Sources of Funding for Women's Research," Linda Meadows, Associate Director, The Ohio State Research Foundation, Ohio State University.

Sexual Preference: An Academic Issue?—A panel presentation, with opportunities for questions and discussion, on campus issues related to sexual preference. The panel will address institutional responses, advising roles, curricular content, classroom issues, and the relationships of these topics to women's studies in the GLCA and the wider world.—Paula Goldsmid, Sociology and Associate Dean, Oberlin; Juliana Mulroy, Biology, Denison; Marj Rowland, Expanded Horizons Program for Women, Wright State University; Barbara Smith, Women's Studies, University of Massachusetts-Boston; and Harriet Turner, Spanish, Oberlin.

Beyond the Letter of the Law: Making the Campus Gender-Fair—This session will summarize laws that define affirmative action, and indicate ways in which we can go beyond the law toward justice. Specific strategies for change will be described, and the current status of these efforts will be discussed. The discussion following the presentations will seek information about strategies being employed in other institutions.—Jane Dickie, Psychology, Hope; Diane Kroll, Office of the Dean of Students, Wooster; and Eric Straumanis, Affirmative Action, Denison.

Teaching Women's Literature From a Regional Perspective—This session will focus on how to collect, evaluate, and edit original archival materials (journals, diaries, letters) and oral testimony. Examples of course syllabi, interviews, and archival exercises, and student projects will be available. Participants will discuss the problems and frustrations inevitably a part of these experimental courses, and the exciting discoveries of women's voices that have formerly gone unheard.—Katie Herzfeld, Antioch student; John Schilb, English, Denison. Coordinated by Marianne Whelchel, Literature, Antioch

Woman for the Year 2000: Transforming the Traditional Curriculum—The College has a two-year grant from The Lilly Endowment for curriculum revision. The committee will discuss problems encountered in beginning this major project and their hopes for what the project will accomplish.—Members of the Committee on Teaching and Learning, Saint Mary's College, Notre Dame, Indiana.

Gender and Genre: Problems in Feminist Literary Theory—"Medea: Hero or Heroine?", Carolyn A. Durham, French, Wooster; "Narrating the Self: Fictional Structures for Female Autonomy," Joanne S. Frye, English, Wooster; and "Tying Things Together: Entrapment and Transcendence in Fortunata y Jacinta," Harriet Turner, Spanish, Oberlin.

3:15 p.m. Concurrent Sessions:

Women's Studies Outside the Classroom—This session will explore ways of creating experiential learning opportunities for women's studies students, both in working for feminist organizations and in applying women's studies tools of observation and analysis to a work setting. The discussion will include suggestions for how to include a field-work component in Women's Studies courses, opportunities available to students through the GLCA Philadelphia Urban Semester, and other possibilities for women's studies students to integrate off-campus learning opportunities with their pursuit of women's studies —Ann Simon, Center for Cooperative Education, Antioch; and Carol Vento, GLCA Philadelphia Urban Semester.

Perspectives on Feminist Theory from Four Fields of Inquiry—An introduction to feminist theory, showing how it emerges in each discipline, with examples of current work. Panelists will question each other and welcome questions from the audience.—Janice Love, Political Science, Denison; Barbara Smith, Women's Studies, University of Massachusetts-Boston; Joan Straumanis, Philosophy, Denison; and Denise Abrams, Sociology, Antioch.

Religious Studies—"Questions and Lines of Development in Feminism and Religious Studies" (a conversation), Louise Reinecke, Religion, DePauw; and Diane Hardin, recent graduate, DePauw; "Can One Be Feminist and Christian?", Joan Novak, Religion, Denison, with response from Robina Quale, History, Albion; and "Space and Silence," Eva Hooker, C.S.C., Associate Dean of the Faculty, Saint Mary's College, Notre Dame, Indiana.

Isolation of Women From One Another in the Academy: Sisters All?—Where are women in our institutions? Where, when, and how can they talk with and support one another in their personal and professional efforts? This session will explore these questions and attempt to represent the diverse experiences of women in the GLCA, where they constitute a sometimes small minority and are distanced from one another by life-style, age, race, position, rank, and discipline.—Paula Goldsmid, Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, Oberlin; Thalia Gouma-Peterson, Art History, Wooster; Beverly Purrington, Sociology, Denison; and Alice Coatney, an Earlham graduate who is now a secretary in the English Department at Earlham.

Toward a Feminist Transformation of Residence Hall Life—In this session, panelists will relate their own experiences as students and administrators to several questions, including: To what extent can feminist women and men take responsibility for and create dialogue about Greek life, parietals, maintenance of residences, and racial, religious, and sexual tensions? To what extent are our institutions allowing that or making it more difficult? How can faculty participate in transforming residence hall life?—Richard Dahl, Assistant Dean of Students, Oberlin; Dawn Hilaael, Student, Ohio Wesleyan; Martha Clements, Student, Hope; Gwyneth Love, Associate Dean of Students, Oberlin; and Katie Herzfeld, Antioch Student/GLCA Women's Studies Program Assistant, as moderator.

Images of Power and Authority—"Role Conflict for Women in Positions of Authority," Elaine Martin, Political Science, Albion; "The Women's Movement: Norm Oriented or Value Oriented? A Need for Reflection," Frances Lucas, Psychology, Albion; and "Industrialization and Liberation," Sanford Greenberg, Political Science, Kalamazoo. Moderator: Elaine Martin.

Changing Our Views of Nineteenth Century Culture in the United States: The Importance of Women as Speakers and Writers—"But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence" (I Timothy, ii 12). Nan Nowik will look at 19th century women who defied St. Paul's stricture--women like Mott, Stanton, Anna Howard Shaw, and Anna Dickinson. She will chronicle how women connected with Quakerism, temperance, abolition, and suffrage gradually won for women the right to speak from the platform, either as reformers or as public speakers on the lyceum circuit. John Schilb will focus on diarists and letter writers, discussing both their value and ways of analyzing their work. In addition, he will suggest revisions of the literary canon that will make it more accurately reflect 19th century U.S. culture.--Nan Nowik and John Schilb, English, Denison.

6:30 p.m. Concurrent Sessions:

Teaching Women in History—Presentations related to teaching women's history, both in separate coures on women in history and in regular history courses. One presentation will describe an introduction to history methodology (early in the history major's career) using the theme "women in U.S. history." The other will discuss an experimental course on women in European history.—Wallace Chessman, History, Denison; Rachel Fuchs, History, Indiana University; and Amy Gordon, History, Denison, as moderator.

The Individual Versus the Academy—What problems does the academy pose for those working within it (especially members of two-career families, women of color, single women) and how must it be changed to effect a better integration of work and life and to create a more humane community?—Margaret Fete, Romance Languages, Ohio Wesleyan; Frances Lucas, Psychology, Albion; and Jon Fuller, GLCA.

Folk Art: What Can It Teach Us?—A slide presentation and discussion of folk tradition as reflected in the history of Folk Puppet Theater. Questions to be addressed include: Are we victims of traditional academic approaches to art? How can a feminist perspective transform our vision of the relationship between the artist and society? How can we incorporate vital and credible folk traditions in an academic structure?—Joyce Parr and Theresa Schupbach, Art, Kenyon.

Transforming Women's Work—"Women and Work: The Managerial Impasse," Robin Bartlett and Charles Poulton-Callahan, Economics, Denison; "Women and Work: The View from a College Placement Office," Kitty Padgett, Career and Life Planning, Albion; "Working It Out: Strategies for Redefining Women's Work," Beverly Purrington, Sociology, Denison; and "A Research Agenda for Transforming Women's Work," Len Berkey, Sociology, Albion.

Student Involvement in Feminist Research—Projects involving students as researchers will be described and some of the findings presented. The session will indicate some alternative possibilities for engaging undergraduate students in women's studies research, as well as spin-off benefits for teachers and students and the resulting impact on the curriculum.—Peter Bankart, Psychology, Wabash; and Margaret Berrio, Psychology, DePauw.

Feminist Literary Criticism Workshop—This workshop seeks to generate a discussion of short works by women writers, including Adrienne Rich and Audre Lorde. Texts will be made available to those attending and the prepared remarks will seek to explore the interfacing of feminism, literary study, and women's experiences (especially as readers and writers).—Barbara Caruso, English, Earlham; Valerie Lee, English, Denison; and Marianne Whelchel, Literature, Antioch.

8:30 p.m. Concert by Kristin Lems!

SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 9

9:00 a.m. Concurrent Sessions:

Current Problems in Teaching Women's Studies—Our student constituency is changing on many of the GLCA campuses. Are the women's studies students of the '80s markedly different from their predecessors? Has the new vocationalism affected our students? Do our students' current perceptions of feminism and the advances of the Women's Movement match reality? How does the hostility to feminists that some students bring to the classroom affect course dynamics?—Nan Nowik, English, Denison.

Men in Women's Studies: Meeting Students' Needs—How do we introduce men to women's studies? How do we make women's studies courses attractive to men? How do we get women's studies material into other courses? What content can we add that would be helpful to men in learning about themselves and examining their own sex-role stereotypes?—Brenda Bankart and Peter Bankart, Psychology, Wabash.

Creators and Creatures: Nineteenth Century Literary Women—"Renunciation in the Bridal Poems of Emily Dickinson," Nadean Bishop, English, Eastern Michigan University; and "Your Girls That You All Love Are Mine: Dracula and the Victorian Male Sexual Imagination," Gail Griffin, English, Kalamazoo. Moderator: Kathleen Reish, Romance Languages, Kalamazoo.

In Search of Our Female Forebears—Out of a research project in which daughters interviewed mothers, a second project emerged: an exhibit of photographs of "generations of women." The workshop will include a discussion of the research project and a slide show and discussion of the exhibit as a facet of our women's studies curriculum.—Doris Friedensohn, Women's Studies, Jersey City State College.

Counseling Women Students or "What To Do When Your Students Come To You With Their Personal Problems"—Many faculty and staff, particulary those involved in women's studies, are frequently approached informally by students wishing to discuss their personal problems or personal reactions to feminist course content. This session will draw on participants' experiences in generating typical issues raised by students and provide a discussion of methods to help faculty and staff assist students' personal growth.—Karen Taylor, Psychology, Ohio Wesleyan; and Brenda Stearns, Financial Aid and Black Student Advising, Ohio Wesleyan.

11:00 a.m. Closing Panel:

"The Women's Studies Connection": Where Are We in the Wider Context? Panelists: Doris Friedensohn, Women's Studies and American Studies, Jersey City State College; Eva Hooker, C.S.C., Associate Dean of the Faculty, Saint Mary's College; and Elaine Reuben, Coordinator, National Women's Studies Association. Moderator: Jon Fuller, GLCA President.

12:30 p.m. Buffet Lunch - Conference Ends